

Graduate Council Minutes

June 3rd, 2011

Attendance: Sergiu Aizicovici, Joseph Bernt, Rathindra Bose, Duncan Brown, Charles Buchanan, Gary Chleboun, Howard Dewald, Jennifer Hines, Jennifer Horner, Steve Howard, Aimee Howley, David Koonce, Christine Mattley, Jan Maxwell, Patrick O'Connor, Shawn Ostermann, Eric Rothenbuhler, and Katherine Tadlock.

Excused: Ken Cutright, Kamile Geist, Myroslav Gerasymchuk, Tracy Kelly, Hans Kruse, Jody Lamb, Molly Morris, David Nichols, Jessica Roney, Charles Smith, Yong Wang, Gary Weckman and Jenna Wittwer.

Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:10 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the May 13th, 2011 meeting

The minutes of the May 13th, 2011 meeting were approved.

2. Chair's Report (Duncan Brown)

A. Thanks to members:

Duncan thanked all members and chairs of all sub-committees for their work throughout the year.

B. Membership for next year:

Duncan informed members that four members' (Gary Chleboun, Hans Kruse, Molly Morris, and Gary Weckman) terms are expiring this year. He reminded members that the appointment to the Graduate Council is for three years with the possibility of extending it for another three years. He also told members that if they think that the dates noted for the expiration of their terms is listed wrongly on the Graduate Council website to contact him so that he can work with Joe McLaughlin, Chair of Faculty Senate to resolve that. Duncan said that it is always helpful if at least some members consider extending their terms; it maintains institutional memory. He added that he is also cognizant of the fact that serving on the Graduate Council is a significant time commitment on the part of members.

C. September meeting of the Graduate Council:

Duncan said that if there are a sufficient number of people present for the September meeting, he would like to have a meeting then. Having a meeting in September allows

for some decisions to be taken during the fall quarter, since Graduate Council does not meet in December.

3. Remarks by Rathindra Bose, Dean of the Graduate College:

A. Thanks to all members:

Rathindra said that he has enjoyed working with the Graduate Council and the Research Council the last three years. He added that he has had a chance to work with some people closely and has appreciated that close interaction. He said that the university is for faculty and students; and administrators come and go. Faculty members make and retain the reputation of the institution. He expressed his congratulations to everyone for making Ohio University what it is today. He said that he is thankful to the Graduate Council for their work in making the Graduate College a functional college. He said that occasionally he has had to make exceptions but he has tried to keep the Graduate Council apprised of those. He said that Jennifer Hines and Katie Tadlock deserve credit for the success of the Graduate College with a small staff.

B. Program Approvals:

Rathindra said that as has been discussed in many meetings of the Graduate Council, program approvals should first take place at the Graduate Council and then they should go to UCC and not vice versa.

C. PDP for Translational Medicine:

He said that this multidisciplinary program which includes faculty from four colleges (Arts and Sciences, OUCOM, Engineering, and Health Sciences and Professions) is very much along the lines of the national trend in Biomedical sciences. He said that a percentage of the \$34 million that OU will be receiving in royalties for the new drug is being used to set up this program. He added that the document which is a part of the packet today is a draft and that it will be tweaked and edited before being sent to the Ohio Board of Regents. In response to Howard's question about the time-frame for this program, Rathindra responded that he hopes that the university processes for the PDP can be completed soon and the PDP then can be sent to OBOR. He added that by this time next year, he expects the full proposal to be sent to OBOR. Rathindra told members that having more master's students benefits the university in terms of amount of subsidy received. He said that \$500,000 of the base budget for this program, \$300,000 will come from the endowment, and \$100,000 each from the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and OUCOM. The colleges of Engineering and Health Sciences and Professions will not be contributing towards the base budget at this point in time. He said that the faculty members who participate in the program will support students in their final two years. He said that this will not be too much of a contribution on their part, since there are about 20 faculty members and it is anticipated that there will be 30 to 40 students in the program. He added that for that many students, the university could receive up to \$200,000 in subsidy and the proposal is for the subsidy to roll back to the participating

departments. He said that 50% of the support for the program is coming from the endowment. Joe Bernt asked if there are other institutions in Ohio that offer this program and if Rathindra was anticipating any resistance from them. Rathindra said that the strength of this program lies in its unique design and there are no programs like this. He added that the Ohio Board of Regents recognizes Ohio University as an entrepreneurial institution. In response to Duncan's question whether UCC had seen this proposal, Rathindra said that if OBOR rejects it, then UCC will not see this proposal.

Remarks by Katie Tadlock

A. Non-Degree Program Codes:

Katie said that the non-degree program codes are housed in the Graduate College and not in University College as the PeopleSoft administrators had originally stated.

B. Graduate Commencement Ceremony:

Katie informed members that 101 doctoral candidates are currently registered to participate in the commencement ceremony next Friday, June 10th, 2011.

4. Policies and Regulations Committee (Chair, David Koonce):

A. Proposal for a graduate ethics statement:

David Koonce drew members' attention to the document in today's packet that notes the academic integrity and professional ethics statement that the committee recommends be used as the 'general ethics statement' in the graduate catalog. David said that committee members looked at similar documents at institutional peers and found that some schools do not have anything listed, while some have entire judicial policies listed as their ethics statement. Eric Rothenbuhler added that ethics statements vary by roles, so students, TAs, and faculty members would have different ethics statements to abide by. Joe Bernt asked for clarification about the first bullet on the document ("uphold esteemed values established by Ohio University"). Charles Buchanan added that it would be helpful to clarify the contents of the second bullet as well ("practice ethical standards established or supported by the college, school, department and discipline of study") to establish greater specificity and to make the document stronger. David Koonce said that they tried to keep this document brief since most disciplines already have an ethics code or something similar to abide by which is dictated by the lead professional organization in that field. Jennifer Hines offered that maybe the five C's to clarify the 'esteemed values'. She said that the five C's listed as the core values on the Ohio University website are character, community, citizenship, civility, and commitment. Joe Bernt said that it would also be helpful to tie the mission statement with this as well. Jennifer Horner suggested eliminating the first bullet and changing the word 'practice' to 'uphold' in the second bullet. Charles Buchanan asked if it could be possible to add text about ethical standards that transcend the specifics, for example treating colleagues and students with respect. Eric Rothenbuhler said that the faculty handbook lists most of these values and standards

and by trying to list some new standards here, there might be the danger of creating conflicting standards. Jennifer Hines said that the taskforce that was responsible for the creation of the Graduate College had noted in its recommendations that every college have an ethics statement which would be posted on the Graduate College website. Rathindra added that the Graduate College would have a general statement about expectations of ethical behavior and students could then follow the link for their own academic colleges to read the one specific to them. Charles said that an overriding statement that notes abiding by a core group of ethical standards would be helpful. David said that the hard part was identifying something that has not already been said and finding ways to administer it.

Discussion focused on reworking the language in the proposed statement and the first part of the final statement is noted in italics below. The text in the rest of the document was not changed and the new document with the changes noted below was approved by Graduate Council.

The Ohio University Graduate College is committed to assisting academic units to successfully recruit, matriculate, retain, and to graduate students. Through this process, the Graduate College expects adherence to standards of behavior that support learning, scholarly research, and creative activity of all students, faculty and staff involved in graduate education. All graduate students, faculty and staff should uphold ethical standards established or supported by the university, college, school, department and discipline of study. Common to all are the principles that students and faculty members will represent their own work with integrity and professionalism, and attribute others' work appropriately and according to their discipline's standards.

B. Proposal to extend the Graduate Catalog for an additional year (AY 2011-12):

Updates to the graduate catalog are made every other year. Per that schedule, the Graduate Catalog is up for review this year, 2011. Significant updates need to be made to the catalog for next year for the change to semesters. Graduate Council approved extending the current catalog for one more academic year, until 2012.

5. Curriculum Committee (Chair, Charles Buchanan) PDP for Joint Master's Degree in Computational and Applied Mathematics between OU and King Abdulaziz University (KAU) in Saudi Arabia:

Introducing the item, Charles said that this was a fairly straightforward proposal. King Abdulaziz University needs the program and Ohio University has the expertise to provide it. This program will facilitate economic development in Saudi Arabia and the Middle East. He added that no additional faculty members will be needed to run the program. The proposed curriculum does not mention any additional courses than already being offered here. Duncan said that it seems that a relatively small number of students are going to be a part of this and the department here seems to be happy with the qualifications of the faculty members who

will be hired in Saudi Arabia. Charles added that the proposal seems solid and that any questions that could be raised seem to have been answered. Sergiu said that curriculum vitae of all faculty members who are employees at KAU are attached to the proposal and most of them have doctoral degrees from US, UK, and other European institutions and there are some OU alums as well. He added that two retired professors from OU, who are also distinguished professors, are listed as visiting professors too. In response to Chris Mattley's question about a master's thesis, Sergiu said that students are encouraged to undertake projects. Duncan said that the programs committee of UCC is reviewing this proposal. Gary Chleboun asked if there was a specific reason for the proposal to have been projected for five years. Howard Dewald said that per standard practice most of the memorandums of understanding are signed for five years. Rathindra said that since this is a proposal for a joint degree, this needs to be approved by the Ohio Board of Regents as well. Katie added that the accrediting organization should be informed as well.

Graduate Council approved the committee's recommendation of approval of this joint degree program.

6. Update on Program Code changes due to Q2S (Jennifer Hines, Interim Associate Dean, Graduate College):

Jennifer Hines told members that the document in today's packet has been updated from last month as programs have been added and removed per decisions being made. Discussion focused on approving the changes in the fall quarter after UCC reviews them and to invite faculty members for their input about the programs that are being discontinued. Aimee said that these changes have come through OCEAN and contacting individual faculty members is not appropriate at this stage and in this venue. She added that clarity about programs versus tracks is required in some cases but the Graduate Council should not be the place for faculty to air their differences with the curriculum committee of their college. Duncan said that he will check with Joe McLaughlin to look at the differences between a program and track and see if there is anything specific noted in the faculty handbook about it.

Jennifer Hines said that the Q2S changes will be moving forward over the summer. Graduate Council voted in favor of accepting the programs that will continue either with changes or with no changes in the semester system.

7. Student at large status at the graduate level:

Katie Tadlock told members that the post-baccalaureate application is easy to complete and does not require too much work on the part of the graduate students who want to take some graduate level courses. Jennifer Horner asked how this would fit with the responsibility centered budgeting model. Rathindra said that currently Ohio University is losing subsidy on these unidentified graduate students. Members discussed that having a category like this will

thus help capture revenue from the state and will reduce the paper work for students interested in taking a few classes. Katie added that this will be helpful to programs like the Principal Licensure and the TESOL that do not meet the criteria to be designated as certificates. Aimee added that they have the same problem with workshops, since they can only be either offered at the regional campuses or only during the summer session in Athens. Members agreed that this should be discussed further.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:56 pm.

Graduate Council Minutes

May 13th, 2011

Attendance: Sergiu Aizicovici, Joseph Bernt, Rathindra Bose, Duncan Brown, Charles Buchanan, Gary Chleboun, Howard Dewald, Jennifer Hines, David Holben for Jennifer Horner, Steve Howard, Aimee Howley David Koonce, Hans Kruse, Jody Lamb, Jan Maxwell, Molly Morris, David Nichols, Shawn Ostermann, Eric Rothenbuhler, Katherine Tadlock,

Excused: Ken Cutright, Kamile Geist, Myroslav Gerasymchuk, Jennifer Horner (David Holben substituting), Tracy Kelly, Christine Mattley, Patrick O'Connor, Jessica Roney, Charles Smith, Yong Wang, Gary Weckman and Jenna Wittwer.

Guests: Chris Gidycz and Angie McCutcheon

Convened: The meeting was convened at 2:10 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the April 8, 2011 meeting

The minutes of the April 8, 2011 meeting were approved.

2. Chair's Report (Duncan Brown)

Duncan told members that Dean Bose will be here shortly since he is presenting awards at the Research Exposition now.

A. Date and time for the June meeting:

Duncan informed members that the June meeting will be on the first Friday of the month instead of the second Friday to keep it within the quarter and to not clash with graduate commencement day. He also added that the meeting time is an hour later than usual since UIC meets from 1 pm to 3 pm that day and there is significant overlap in the membership of both bodies.

B. Membership for next year:

Duncan reminded members that the Committee on Committees of the Faculty Senate will be sending out a call for nominations for the Graduate Council shortly. He added that members of the Graduate Council are appointed for a three year term with the possibility of extending it for another three years. Duncan said that it is always helpful if at least some members consider extending their terms; it maintains institutional memory. He added that he is also cognizant of the fact that serving on the Graduate Council is a significant time commitment on the part of members.

C. Thanks to committee chairs and committee members:

Duncan thanked members and chairs of all sub-committees for their work thus far.

3. Remarks by Rathindra Bose, Dean of the Graduate College:

Duncan congratulated Rathindra Bose for his new position. Rathindra said that this was an opportunity that was hard to turn down for him. He added that a good administrator does not do harm to the institution. The institution is for faculty and students. He said that the role of the Graduate College and the Research Office is to facilitate strategic planning and not to get in the way of the academic departments.

Rathindra said that he was delayed because he was at the Research Exposition. He added that the Research Exposition is an example of the scholarly output of our students. He noted that budget cuts should not affect activities like this.

A. Joint Graduate Program in Mathematics with King Abdul Aziz University:

Rathindra said that the Ohio Board of Regents might have questions about this program since part of the program is being offered here and part in Saudi Arabia. He added that we do not have any control over the tenure process, hiring and other administrative issues for the faculty in Saudi Arabia. Duncan said that he will try to have it on the agenda for the June meeting. Jennifer Hines said that this was discussed at the UCC meeting this past Tuesday and will go through the appropriate processes, but just in an expedited manner. In response to questions, Howard Dewald said that the proposal is being reviewed by the Curriculum Committee of the College.

B. Academic Restructuring:

Rathindra said that he will write a memo for the Ohio Board of Regents about the programs that went through name changes due to the structural reorganization of the academic colleges.

C. Translational Medicine:

He said that the program is being reviewed by an ad hoc committee. It is an interdisciplinary program.

Remarks by Katie Tadlock

A. Non-Degree Program Codes:

Katie informed members that in the new student information system all the non-degree graduate programs have been coded under the University College framework. She told members that the administrative processes governing non-degree students have always been difficult. It is difficult to award financial aid to them, to track them through the system and it is not possible to issue a certificate of eligibility (to facilitate the issuance of a visa) for international students. She said that if Graduate Council would take the lead

in formulating the 'student-at-large' category that has been talked about for some time now, it will be very helpful. She explained that in the new information system the non-degree codes have been set up as minors, but graduate students do not have minors. She added that there is probably logic behind setting them up so, maybe it is helpful for registration or billing.

B. Shortening the Commencement Ceremony:

Katie informed members that the handout in today's packet is a copy of the official memo received from the President's office about accepting Graduate Council's recommendations regarding shortening the commencement ceremony. She said that the ceremony should be 45 minutes shorter with these cuts in place and it would probably end by noon.

4. Report on Graduate Program Code Changes due to Q2S:

Jennifer Hines told members that she will have the complete list of all program codes sent to everyone electronically. The handout in today's packet lists the codes that Graduate Council could and should review. She added that the item about the new degree in Geography is on today's agenda. She also said that she will send an updated list about these codes as well, since it seems that the elimination of the MA in Photography did not show up on this list. That program was eliminated 20 years ago, but the code still remains. Jennifer Hines told members that a form needs to be submitted by the department to the office of Institutional Research noting that the program has been eliminated. If that form is not completed, then programs continue to show up on the Registrar's list.

Duncan said that for items in group C, members can make recommendations about programs they are familiar with. For items in group B, he added the process outlined in the Faculty handbook will need to be followed. This would involve the programs being reviewed by the curriculum committees of the appropriate colleges. Jennifer Hines said that all of these programs have been approved by UCC or are close to it and they all note that the UCC approval, if received is pending Graduate Council approval. The goal is to have them all done by the end of this year. It was also mentioned that the Graduate College has to inform the Regents' Advisory Committee on Graduate Study about all discontinued programs. Duncan said that we all know about the financial crisis facing us and that it is important to know that none of these programs are being discontinued due to people leaving the University. Jennifer Hines added that Jeff Giesey, Gregory Kremer and Dave Thomas have been kept informed during this process of determining which Q2S program code decisions might be reviewed further by Graduate Council.

5. Recruitment and Admissions Requirements Committee (Chair, Gary Chleboun):

Joe Bernt said that since the title of the employee is Research Engineer, he is an employee first and student second. He recommended the removal of the sentence that his situation is similar to TAs, GAs and PACE positions since it seems like a false analogy. In response to Molly Morris' question about the false analogy, Joe Bernt said that the nature of relationships are different between students and faculty and employees who are students and faculty. Sergiu said that a student who is a GA or TA or RA is a student first and then an employee. However, in this case, the person is first an employee and then a student. Gary said that it seemed similar to them since both are getting paid by the university. Rathindra said that sometimes students are funded through external grants, in those cases, the professor grades students work, he/she is also responsible for paying them, and is maybe also the student's advisor. He said that we do not want to question the integrity and judgment of our faculty. Molly Morris said that she does not think there is a conflict in this situation; she said it would be a conflict of interest if the roles were reversed. Eric Rothenbuhler said that in this case, one evaluator is playing two roles. Joe Bernt said that there should be some criteria about courses that employees can take.

Graduate Council voted in favor of the motion to strike the second paragraph from the committee's recommendation and starting the now second paragraph with 'Because' instead of 'Therefore'. Howard Dewald said that the course number noted should be CHE 642 and not CHEM 642, since that could potentially be a call number for a Chemistry course.

Graduate Council then voted in favor of accepting the committee's recommendation about the conflict of interest case of Cody Shaffer.

6. Graduate Student Affairs and Fellowships Committee (Chair, Chris Mattley):

Discussion focused on whether students or alumni would buy the regalia. Jennifer Hines said that while purchasing regalia, the company, does not ask for identification in terms of someone being an Ohio University student or an alumni. Katie Tadlock said that there is a chance that students who have already bought that regalia will come to the commencement ceremony this year in those robes. She added that it will put her and the staff of the Graduate College in a very difficult situation to 'police' the students about the kind of robes they have on. Katie Tadlock also reminded members that since the deadline to apply for graduation has passed, most students have already either purchased or made arrangements for the regalia that they will be wearing. She also added that the communication that goes out from the Graduate College about the commencement ceremony is limited only to the doctoral students.

Members discussed the wording of the resolution and voted in favor of passing it with the final wording as:

Graduate Council recommends that students must wear the standard black robes at Commencement. Without the rental option the custom regalia costs seem to be prohibitive for most students. Graduate Council endorses Graduate Student Senate's resolution on custom regalia.

7. Curriculum Committee (Chair, Charles Buchanan):

MS in Geography:

Members discussed the differences between the proposed degree and the degree currently being offered. In response to some questions about duplication of programs, Rathindra Bose said that it is usually a concern at the doctoral level; it is not much of an issue at the Master's level. He said that the new MS degree will have more emphasis on research. Jennifer Hines added that two courses taken by students will also be different for the two degrees. Charles Buchanan said that it was not possible to compare the two degrees since the proposal document did not provide information about the existing degree. Jennifer Hines said that the information is probably in the response document.

Graduate Council voted in favor of accepting the committee's recommendation about the proposed MS degree in Geography.

8. Policies and Regulations Committee (Chair, David Koonce):

Members discussed the issue that was raised last month about allowing two doctoral students from the department of Psychology to participate in the upcoming commencement ceremony before the completion of their internships. Katie Tadlock said that some institutions allow students to participate without the completion of all requirements. Howard Dewald said that the students have petitioned the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the petition includes a letter from the internship director that the students will complete their internship by a certain date in June, in this case it is the 15th of June, 2011. Chris Gidycz added that one of these two students who the department is requesting a waiver in policy for is the strongest student she has seen come across in the program in the 23 years that she has been here. She said that the student completed her dissertation in June 2010 and all the other requirements as well. She will be starting a job as a faculty member at a university in New Hampshire in August 2011. Chris Gidycz said that she is respectful of the sanctity of the ceremony, and participation in the ceremony is important to the student. She added that this student has 17 peer reviewed publications already. Chris Gidycz also told members that in the 23 years that she has been here, she has never had a student not complete their internship.

Shawn Ostermann said that it gets complicated when we use specific examples. People miss deadlines and to make exceptions in one case typically opens doors for other issues as well. Molly Morris said that she understands that and as faculty most everyone has very strict rules about deadlines for home work and assignments. But, supporting this request she added shows our support to an exceptional student. Members discussed if it was possible to have something in place which would allow for internships to end earlier in June. Chris Gidycz said that since the program here is accredited, they are required to follow the criteria laid out by the American Psychological Association, their accrediting body. Rathindra Bose told members that checks and balances are in place while reviewing such requests. He added that the Dean of the academic college is endorsing this request before it can go any further.

In response to a question about exceptions made in the past, Katie Tadlock said that one exception was made by the Provost since there were some immigration issues involved in that case. And, she said that Dr. Bose made an exception for a candidate to process with the Master's students and the student was not hooded. Katie Tadlock also noted that when these students signed their internship contracts they would have known that they would not complete their internships in time for the commencement ceremony. She also added that there are students in other programs who could potentially run into a similar situation.

Majority of the members of the Graduate Council voted in favor of allowing Katie Edwards and Danielle Probst to petition the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the Graduate College to request participation in the commencement ceremony on June 10th, 2011.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 pm. The next meeting is on June 3rd from 3 to 5 pm in BUC 230.

Graduate Council Minutes

April 8th, 2011

Attendance: Sergiu Aizicovici, Joseph Bernt, Rathindra Bose, Duncan Brown, Charles Buchanan, Howard Dewald, Kamile Geist, Jennifer Hines, Jennifer Horner, David Koonce, Tracy Kelly, Hans Kruse, Jody Lamb, Christine Mattley, Jan Maxwell, Molly Morris, David Nichols, Shawn Ostermann, Ann Paulins for Aimee Howley, Jessica Roney, Yong Wang, and Jenna Wittwer.

Excused: Gary Chleboun, Ken Cutright, Myroslav Gerasymchuk, Steve Howard, Aimee Howley (Ann Paulins substituting), Patrick O'Connor, Eric Rothenbuhler, Charles Smith, Katherine Tadlock, and Gary Weckman.

Guests: Chris Gidycz and Angie McCutcheon

Convened: The meeting was convened at 2:08 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the March 11, 2011 meeting

The minutes of the March 11, 2011 meeting were approved.

2. Chair's Report (Duncan Brown)

Duncan informed members that Dean Bose will arrive around 3 pm since he is currently in a meeting with the President. He also told members that Katie Tadlock is attending a Rufus Initiative meeting and thus will not be attending the Graduate Council meeting today.

3. Remarks by Interim Associate Dean of the Graduate College (Jennifer Hines)

A. Regalia for Commencement:

Jennifer Hines informed members that the President has approved the recommendation for OU special regalia and that information about the new regalia was sent to all faculty, staff and students. She added that the information is also available on the commencement website. Jennifer said that it is not mandatory to have the new regalia for this year's ceremony.

Tracy Kelly said that the Graduate Student Senate is concerned about it since the proposed robes are green in color and the ones that students currently buy are black; and

the cost for the newly approved ones is very high. She said that she understands that doctoral candidates might want to purchase the custom regalia since they will probably wear it at other commencements in the future. She added that having everyone in one color would preserve the dignity of the ceremony as well. This decision came through the President and Provost's offices. David Nichols said that the doctoral regalia are priced at \$890. He added that if two people are standing next to each other in two different kinds of robes, it has the potential to portray a false hierarchy of achievements. He added that during the presentation to Graduate Student Senate the price for the Master's robes was quoted to be in the range of \$30 to \$60, but the cost is \$390, which is prohibitive for most students. In response to Joe Bernt's question about the origin of this proposal, Tracy Kelly responded that she believes that the proposal was initiated by some alumni and the regalia committee reviewed the options before presenting its report to the President. Ann Paulins (sitting in for Aimee Howley today), who was on the regalia committee said that this issue was brought forth by an MFA alumnus. She added that Ohio University has never had its official robe, and the expectation is not that everyone will purchase the custom robes, but if someone should so desire, then they have that option. Many institutions provide that option she noted. Jennifer Hines said that when she was first approached by Marty Tuck she had told him that GSS should be involved in this discussion. Hans said that the robes should be the same color, and wondered if it was possible to have the possibility of renting them as well. David Nichols said that Marty Tuck had noted that the cost would be too prohibitive to do so.

Duncan said that he and Tracy would work together on this and would keep Graduate Council informed about the next steps they take.

B. Shortening the Commencement Ceremony:

Jennifer Hines informed members that per the discussion during the February 2011 meeting of the Graduate Council, the proposed ideas for shortening the commencement ceremony were forwarded to the Provost and President by the University Commencement Committee. These include reducing the number of speakers and length of speeches, cutting back on the various introductions, streamlining the back and forth at the microphone, and introducing degree candidates on both sides of the platform simultaneously (alternating sides), limiting escorts to one per graduate, and asking Deans to consider hosting hooding ceremonies receptions prior to the commencement ceremony.

C. Q2S Updates about programs:

Jennifer Hines said that the lists of programs with no changes, programs with significant changes and discontinued programs are still being reconciled since there were many discrepancies on those lists. She said that for example, a program that was on the list for being discontinued also showed up on the list for programs that do not have significant changes and so on. She added that 84 program codes were missing from the first list that she had received. Now, all the programs are accounted for, but they need to be on one list each and not on multiple ones. She added that she has requested reconciled lists from Jeff Giesey and hopes to have them before the next meeting.

D. RUFUS Update:

Jennifer informed members that the Graduate College is making progress in this area, but a lot of work still needs to be done to switch over to the new business systems and automate as many processes as possible.

4. Graduate Student Affairs and Fellowships Committee (Chris Mattley):

Chris Mattley informed members that the committee enjoyed reviewing the student proposals. She added that some of these proposals were just outstanding and that the committee feels that we should be able to offer more such fellowships. She noted that there probably is a way to raise money from donors to have more such named fellowships. She said that this year there were 18 nominations; some departments submitted two nominations each. To avoid departments from submitting more than one nomination in the future, she added that we should revisit the language in the guidelines and clarify the nomination criteria.

Rathindra Bose said that the information for the Named Fellowships had been sent to all departments, but it seems that due to some changes in leadership in the department of English some students did not receive notifications and thus the department was not able to nominate anyone. He said that he would hate to see a graduate student suffer for something that was not his or her fault. And, in that light he proposed to Graduate Council that if members of the Graduate Student Affairs and Fellowships committee would agree to review another nomination and if they deem that nomination worthy of being awarded a fellowship, he will find the money to fund the fellowship. In response to Chris Mattley's question about how the call for these nominations was sent out, Jennifer Hines said that the Graduate College uses the list of Graduate Chairs/Program Directors to send such information out. She said that the email was sent on March 10th 2011, and the website was updated on March 3rd, 2011 and a paper copy of the call for nominations was mailed to the department contact. Since there is significant variation in department structures, sometimes the person listed on the Graduate College list is a graduate chair and sometimes it is the department chair. For the department of English, the department chair is listed and the graduate chair who was advising the student did not realize that he was looking at last year's information and deadlines. Jennifer said that last year the call for nominations process was delayed because the Graduate College did not have budget information and thus did not know if these fellowships would be able to be funded.

Jennifer Horner said that sometimes the email notifications from the Graduate College are not clear about the audience they are meant for. She suggested having a header or disclaimer at the top that would note who this email is intended for. Jennifer Hines said that she hopes that things will be easier to target the appropriate recipient when Ohio University starts using the identity management system. That will help to clarify people's roles and thus disseminating information will be easier. Rathindra Bose said that he agrees that the message does get diluted when it is a blanket email to a large group, but hopefully that at least ensures that

someone reads it and forwards it if required. Jennifer Horner said that as Associate Dean she is also mindful of the fact of any department not having a chair or the like. In such a situation she ensures that someone else is taking care of that issue. Howard Dewald said that there could be another department that did not hear about it, but has not complained thus far and since English has complained, we are trying to find a way to resolve it. Rathindra Bose said that this complaint came to him from the VP for Student Affairs. In response to Ann Paulin's question about the information being available on the website, Jennifer Hines said that it was on the website and paper notifications were also sent to all departments. Joe Bernt said that since there are such a miniscule number of these fellowships, they are not a part of the culture of the graduate students. If there were more of these, maybe there would be enough awareness among the graduate students as well. Rathindra Bose said that he is always willing to help and support graduate students, but given the current discussion he thinks it best to withdraw his proposal. Jennifer Hines requested the Associate Deans to help spread the word about such things in their program/department Chair and/or Director meetings. She added that the Graduate College will try to improve upon the disclaimer at the top of each message sent. Duncan Brown added that this year the time period between the deadline for submission and when the notice was sent was very short and there were no meetings of the Associate Directors of Graduate Study in his college between that time period.

Rathindra Bose said that since he was not aware of the percentage of budget cuts for the Graduate College, this information could not be communicated to the departments earlier. Hans said that this reiterates the fact that these fellowships are not externally funded and that we have no externally funded fellowships for graduate students. He added that having them be a part of the base budget means they can be cut anytime there is a cut in the budget. Rathindra said that despite all the budget cuts, he did not let a single penny be cut from graduate student support and he has proposed to the President a fundraising campaign for graduate fellowships and believes that if he had the Graduate Council's support in that endeavor it would be very helpful. Tracy Kelly said that the Graduate Student Senate would like to help with that as well. Duncan said that the Graduate Council can come up with a specific proposal for this.

Rathindra Bose withdrew his proposal to offer the department of English an opportunity to nominate a student. Graduate Council approved the nominations proposed by the Graduate Student Affairs and Fellowships committee.

Jennifer Hines then presented an informational item for Graduate Council members, that before Pete Wickman was nominated for the Named Fellowships an exception, for the per term registration requirement to receive the fellowship had been approved by Duncan on behalf of Graduate Council. Pete will only be required to register for one credit hour per term and will not receive a tuition scholarship. He was the President of Graduate Student Senate for a couple of years and thus was not able to make as much progress in his graduate program as he thought he would and would run into the terms funded limit during the fellowship. Howard Dewald had made the exception request on behalf of Pete's nominating department and it was approved prior to the department submitting Pete's nomination packet.

5. Curriculum Committee (Charles Buchanan, Chair):

Charles informed members that all of the four degree designation change requests on today's agenda have come from the restructuring of academic departments, schools, and colleges. He added that there are no curricular changes in any of these programs. The names now reflect the programs and their home departments and/or schools better. Jennifer Horner added that Rathindra Bose and Jennifer Hines will inform RACGS. Jennifer Hines told members that all of these requests were approved by UCC pending Graduate Council approval. Brief discussion focused on UCC approving these programs before they are presented to Graduate Council. One possible reason mentioned was the meeting schedule of both groups. Jennifer Horner said that she believes there has been a good bit of collaboration with UCC in the last year or so and thinks that it might help to have combined collaborative meetings with them.

Graduate Council approved the committee's recommendations regarding all four of the degree designation change requests.

6. Remarks by Rathindra Bose, Dean of the Graduate College:

Rathindra said that with the change in budget proposals and discussions in Washington, we will all feel the impact. He added that discussions about funds for Pell grants and NSF grants will have repercussions for us and our students. He encouraged members to contact legislators and express concerns about funding cuts towards undergraduate and graduate education.

7. Policies and Regulations Committee (David Koonce, Chair):

A. Commencement Exercises for Doctoral Students in Clinical Psychology:

Chris Gidycz introduced the item. She informed members that students pursuing a doctoral degree in Clinical Psychology are required to complete a one year internship as a part of the program and for licensure. Students complete all their other requirements before starting the internship. Thus, their dissertations have been completed, defended and submitted. Most of these internships end in the summer, some as early as the middle of June. In response to David Koonce's question about the scenario if someone does not complete the internship, Chris Gidycz said that this has not happened in the last 23 years. She added that she can request a letter from the internship director stating that the student is on schedule to complete the internship by the said date, which could be no later than August 31st of that year. She said that the department is seeking the exception to the rule for participating in commencements for students who complete their internships before the date for summer graduation and those who have completed everything else before the spring graduation deadline.

Jennifer Horner said that the Masters of Audiology students participate in commencement even though their internships do not end until August. David Nichols said that is the difference between the rules for masters and doctoral students participating in the commencement ceremony. Doctoral students are required to have completed everything, he added to be able to participate. Jennifer Hines on behalf of Katie Tadlock said that this could become an issue for other professional doctorates as well, so the policy should be written with that in mind. In response to Jennifer Horner's comment about the policy should be broad to accommodate other programs as well, Rathindra Bose said that could become problematic. Duncan said that it seems that the best way to deal with this issue would be to make the exception (if that is the decision that members make) for these students and then work on writing the policy.

David Nichols asked if the students will be hooded at the ceremony. Howard Dewald said that the students will be hooded, but will not receive the diploma and their names will not be mentioned in the program. Charles Buchanan asked about the possibility of the student not performing well during the internship. Chris Gidycz said that they receive evaluations of students pursuing internships throughout the year and the degree is not being conferred until the internship is over. She reiterated that she has never had a student not complete the internship. She also said that many schools that make this exception ask for letters from the internship director that the student is on schedule to complete the internship. Rathindra Bose said that at the commencement ceremony he announces to all assembled as he addresses the President that these students have completed all requirements for the conferral of the degree. He added that since this will not be entirely true, some subtext will need to be added to his initial comments. He also said that at Kent State University, they use some text to address this issue. Hans Kruse agreed that the language should be changed to reflect the facts. Duncan Brown added that this also separates the hooding from the conferral of degrees. Rathindra Bose said that in the past at Ohio University we have not made exceptions for Ph.D. students. Ann Paulins said that this issue arises because at Ohio University we only have one commencement ceremony. David Koonce said that once we are on semesters and if we have three commencement ceremonies, this issue will fix itself. Joe Bernt said that if someone feels so strongly about participating in the ceremony, they will come back the following year to do so.

Jennifer Horner said that she believes that the commencement ceremony is a celebration and students should be able to participate in the ceremony. Molly Morris echoed the sentiment and said that participation in the ceremony is about kudos for the student for their accomplishments and if we deny them participation in the ceremony, we are missing the point of all this. David Nichols said that however, it should be confirmed that the degree is not being conferred at that point in time. Jennifer Horner suggested that the Policies and Regulations committee along with Graduate Student Senate can draft some language about this. Rathindra Bose added that it will be beneficial to collect information from other universities in Ohio as well. Tracy Kelly said that if some of the

members from Graduate Council would attend the next GSS meeting, a discussion could be started.

B. Requests for Exceptions to Thesis and Dissertation format requirements:

Members reviewed the hand out in today's packet about the request from two students from the department of English who are seeking an exception to the style guide and formatting guidelines required to be followed for the completion of their theses and dissertations. Discussion focused on students having the expressive freedom while maintaining the structure of the document required. Hans Kruse asked about the students from the College of Fine Arts and how their materials are handled. Angie McCutcheon said that students have some amount of flexibility as long as they follow the style guide for the required and relevant parts of the document. Members discussed some of the specific issues with these two documents in light of the four recommendations made by the committee. David Koonce added that the discussion of hegemony in these two documents addresses breaking existing constructs and the students' expression is reflective of that. Hans Kruse said that front part of the document should be consistent otherwise it lends itself to misinterpretation. If this is a dissertation written by an Ohio University student, then it should look like one. Members were in agreement that the document should follow some style guide and should adhere to the basic requirements of formatting the front of the document.

Duncan asked Angie McCutcheon to send to David Koonce and Duncan Brown revised guidelines that would be inclusive of the suggestions made by the committee and members of the Graduate Council.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 pm. The next meeting is on May 13th from 2 to 4 pm in BUC 230.

Graduate Council Minutes

March 11, 2011

Attendance: Sergiu Aizicovici, Rathindra Bose, Duncan Brown, Charles Buchanan, Howard Dewald, Kamile Geist, Jennifer Hines, Jennifer Horner, Nick Creary for Steve Howard, Aimee Howley, David Koonce, Tracy Kelly, Hans Kruse, Jody Lamb, Christine Mattley, Jan Maxwell, Molly Morris, Patrick O'Connor, Shawn Ostermann, Jessica Roney, and Jenna Wittwer.

Excused: Joseph Bernt, Gary Chleboun, Ken Cutright, Myroslav Gerasymchuk, Steve Howard (Nick Creary substituting), Aimee Howley (Tracy Leinbaugh substituting), David Nichols, Eric Rothenbuhler, Charles Smith, Katherine Tadlock, Yong Wang, and Gary Weckman.

Convened: The meeting was convened at 2:08 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the February 11, 2011 meeting

The minutes of the February 11, 2011 meeting were approved with a change in item 4 A (per Nick Creary) about the primary department in the IIP program being represented on the guidance committee.

Hans said that the list of programs that was a part of the packet at the February meeting for the Q2S changes seemed to be missing some programs. The list did not have the ITS program, which has been approved. Hans spoke to Greg Kremer after the Graduate Council meeting and Greg confirmed that the ITS program had been approved, but somehow was not reflected on that list. It was discussed that a new and revised list should be requested from UCC that reflects the most updated status of all programs.

2. Chair's Report (Duncan Brown)

A. Degree name and designation changes:

Duncan Brown said that the Curriculum committee will be reviewing the five programs that have come forward with changes in their degree names and designations. These programs have already been reviewed by UCC.

B. Graduate Students Grievance Appeals Process:

Duncan said that the appeals process for handling graduate student grievances does not take into account the existence of the Graduate College. He added that in the past, grievances were sent to the Graduate Student Affairs and Fellowships committee. Duncan recommended to members to review similar policies about handling graduate student grievances at the institutions members were familiar with by virtue of either having studied or worked there. Jennifer Hines said that she will send the link where the current Ohio University policy can be found. She added that it seems that the current policy about handling student grievances seems to be written from an undergraduate

perspective. Shawn Ostermann asked about the relationship between the home college and the graduate college in a case like this. Jennifer Hines said that so far, all of the issues have been resolved by the home college, but it would be best to have a written policy for an instance when an issue does not get resolved by the home college.

Note: The link for the grievance policy which Jennifer Hines referred to above is, http://www.ohio.edu/students/handbook/policies/index.cfm#CP_JUMP_323433

C. Named Fellowships 2010-2011:

Duncan informed members that the nominations for the five Named Fellowships are now open; the deadline for nominations is March 23rd, 2011. He reminded members that the Graduate Student Affairs and Fellowships committee will review the nominations and identify five nominees and two back-ups to be announced at the April 8th, 2011 meeting of the Graduate Council. In response to Chris Mattley's question about eligibility for a student who is not registered for classes this quarter, Duncan read the requirements aloud and said that the requirements note that the student should have completed at least one year in the program but does not mention anything about being registered during this particular quarter.

3. Remarks by Dean of the Graduate College (Rathindra Bose) and Interim Associate Dean of the Graduate College (Jennifer Hines)

A. Meeting with the Provost about offering a BS/MS program for revenue enhancement:

Rathindra Bose informed members that he met with the Provost recently and proposed the idea of wanting to explore offering a combined BS/MS program in some departments as a pilot project to enhance revenues for the departments and the Graduate College. He added that the environmental scan document for the Graduate College mentions this. He said that he told the Provost that he has mentioned this idea at a Graduate Council meeting but has not spoken to any of the Deans yet. He added that Ohio University is not generating as much STEM subsidy as it could and thus those seem to be the easiest areas to tap for this pilot. He said that even if we retain about 100 undergraduate students for their Master's degrees, we could increase the amount of subsidy by \$1.2 to \$2.8 million. Rathindra said that before these programs can be proposed an evaluation of departmental capacity will be necessary. He said that he would like to propose that a part of that revenue received be allocated to the department offering instruction and a part to the Graduate College. He said that currently the Graduate College is functioning with only 12 FTE and they process about 5000 applications every year and there are about 4000 enrolled graduate students. He said that the Provost did not say yes or no to the idea during that meeting, and now he would like to request guidance from the Graduate Council to create the Program Development Plan.

Shawn Ostermann said that the programs would have to be named differently to facilitate tracking. He also cautioned against overestimating the market for such programs. Rathindra said that these students would be admitted the graduate program while during their junior or senior years of college. Shawn said that currently that is a common practice in engineering and students get credit for some graduate courses they take in

their senior year. Jennifer Hines noted that she is aware of some blending of courses in the Biomedical engineering program and that there are four existing policies that pertain to this (Honors Tutorial College, Senior for graduate credit, Transfer of credit policy, and the dual masters program). Rathindra said that this could attract some undergraduate students who would not have come to OU if they did not have this option. Molly Morris said that she is supportive of the idea and added that if it was possible for undergraduate students to spend only one more year and earn a Master's degree, some of them would stay for it. Kamile Geist added that the Music Therapy program also offers an entry level Music Certificate program and asked if these could be offered at the regional campuses as well. Rathindra said that all graduate programs are offered through the Athens campus. He added that in consultation with the Graduate Council he would like to identify about five programs for this. Duncan said that the faculty in his school are in the process of reviewing graduate applications and about five of those applications are from their current undergraduate students. Hans added that they offer a one year professional Master's degree and this is now the second year where their Bachelor's students are applying for the graduate program. He said that this also is probably an indicator of the current economic situation, but they have also noted the demand for the professional master's degree from the industry as well. The professional master's degree facilitates better mid-level jobs.

Rathindra said that there are a lot of details that need to be worked out for this proposal. An important one is about offering tuition waivers to support these students and to provide more value to them in staying here. Hans agreed and added that this could potentially bring in some fee payers as well, since adding one more year does not seem that prohibitive. Shawn added that his department has had great success with students from the HTC.

B. Request for exception in the TAD format:

Rathindra said a request has been received by the Graduate College to grant an exception to the current format being followed by the Thesis and Dissertation Services. He said that this is a complex issue and he would like to be able to advise the college appropriately, since discipline specific variations are taken into account. He added that approve exceptions piecemeal is always problematic, since it might not be fair to those who do not ask for them. He said that he would rather update the policy to include some discipline specific variations if that is what is required. Shawn asked about the nature of the exceptions being requested. Howard Dewald said that the issue is not about the guideline for the template. Jennifer Hines said that the issue probably should go to a sub-committee and then the sub-committee can bring forth their recommendations to the Graduate Council. Rathindra added that there are many things that need to be considered while approving these variations since publication standards have to be adhered to and guidelines for other ancillary processes like Proquest etc. have to be taken into account as well. Jennifer Horner said that probably the TAD steering committee should visit this issue before it goes to any other sub-committee.

C. Update from the Graduate College (Jennifer Hines):

Jennifer Hines said there is a lot going on at the Graduate College. She added that the delay in the Rufus project has been beyond the control of the Graduate College and stop-

gap measures have been taken to admit students. She said that application numbers for fall of 2011 and for the year in general are up, since a lot of the online programs do not necessarily admit only for the fall quarter. Duncan added that Katie is busy with Rufus testing and that is why is not at the meeting today.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:56 pm. The next meeting is on April 8th from 2 to 4 pm in BUC 230.

Graduate Council Minutes

February 11, 2011

Attendance: Sergiu Aizicovici, Joseph Bernt, Rathindra Bose, Duncan Brown, Charles Buchanan, Gary Chleboun, Ken Cutright, Howard Dewald, Kamile Geist, Jennifer Hines, Jennifer Horner, Nick Creary for Steve Howard, Aimee Howley, Tracy Kelly, Hans Kruse, Jody Lamb, Christine Mattley, Jan Maxwell, Molly Morris, Patrick O'Connor, Shawn Ostermann, Eric Rothenbuhler, Charles Smith.

Excused: Myroslav Gerasymchuk, Steve Howard (Nick Creary substituting), David Koonce, David Nichols, Jessica Roney, Katherine Tadlock, Yong Wang, Gary Weckman, and Jenna Wittwer.

Guests: Nick Creary (for item number four) and Greg Kremer (for item number six)

Convened: The meeting was convened at 2:08 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the January 14, 2011 meeting

The minutes of the January 14, 2011 meeting were approved.

2. Chair's Report (Duncan Brown)

A. Seven-Year Reviews:

Duncan Brown said that he met with Rob Brennan, the Chair of the Review committee of UCC about the process followed for seven-year reviews. He said that UCC appreciates the summaries (for the seven-year reviews) sent by Graduate Council. Duncan added that per the request of the members of the Graduate Council, he has copied the Provost on the email he sends to Dave Thomas (Chair of UCC) about the seven-year review. He said that this past set of reviews made a compelling case that resources for graduate programs have been diminishing and that the situation has only become worse over the last few years. The first of the reviews that came to Graduate Council last month was written in 2006, so it provided a good perspective of the last few years.

B. Graduate Programs for Q2S:

Duncan said that Greg Kremer will be here later today and will be able to address all questions that members might have.

3. Remarks by Dean of the Graduate College (Rathindra Bose) and Interim Associate Dean of the Graduate College (Jennifer Hines)

A. Commencement Ceremony:

Rathindra Bose said that it has been recommended to review the procedures followed during the commencement ceremony to find ways to reduce the time taken for it. He said that he is fine with eliminating actions that are not directly significant to the ceremony, as long as the ceremony is still meaningful for the graduates.

Tracy said that she would be fine with eliminating the speech by the President of the Graduate Student Senate. Discussion also focused on eliminating the speech by the alumni representative. Jennifer Hines said that Katie told her that Graduate Council could consider two approaches that would reduce the time taken for the ceremony. One is that candidates not have a second escort and two, a different way for the processional to walk in. It takes about 30 minutes for the processional and for everyone to get seated. Hans Kruse said that he does not think having a second escort adds that much more time. He added that getting everyone in their seats in a shorter time seems like a better way to cut down the time taken for the ceremony. Tracy added that the speeches by the platform party could be streamlined as well so that there isn't that much shuffling back and forth of people coming up to the microphone. Joe Bernt said that there is very little faculty representation during commencement and that the people in the platform party play little to no roles in the success of the students earning the degrees. Gary Chleboun added that introductions of everyone on the platform party also take up considerable amount of time.

Duncan said that it seems like that it would be appropriate to make faculty more visible, and streamline the processional and seating, but not cut short the student focused parts. Hans said that institution in England where his daughter graduated from had small and intimate ceremonies by college and had only one administrator and the rest were faculty. Rathindra said that University of Tennessee follows a similar process. Jennifer Horner said that another option is to have the hooding at the college level, where the colleges can host a reception for the students and their families. And, the students would then walk across the stage with their hoods on.

B. New Graduate Programs:

Rathindra said that he had a very productive meeting with Duncan about the process to be followed for initiating new graduate programs. He said that the program development plan (PDP) is a preliminary document, no more than five pages that basically states the intent for offering a graduate program. And, that the PDP does not have to be necessarily approved by all bodies on campus. The PDP is submitted to the Ohio Board of Regents to ask for their guidance about the viability of the program.

Duncan said that Rathindra would present a proposal that would go to OBOR and Graduate Council simultaneously. In response to Joe Bernt's question about whether other universities were following this procedure, Rathindra said that this is normal procedure for most institutions.

C. Change in doctoral subsidy:

Rathindra said that the seven-year reviews of so many of our graduate programs are coming at a very opportune time given the changes being proposed in the state share of instruction for doctoral students. He said that so far the doctoral subsidy has been a fixed amount as long as a certain head count is maintained. If the number of students goes

below 85% of the threshold, the SSI received gets reduced. But, if the number of doctoral students increases beyond the set threshold, the institution does not receive an increased amount of the SSI for that. He said that under the new system, SSI is going to be tied to different set of criteria and not headcount. The criteria that will be used are quality of the program, number of funded students enrolled, and the number of doctoral degrees awarded in a year. This new formula will replace the old formula incrementally over the course of the next five years.

- D. Q2S conversion for the Graduate College: Jennifer Hines said that the binder for the Graduate College has been removed from the Q2S workflow.
- E. People Soft and On Base Update: Jennifer Hines informed members that Katie Tadlock is working on a way to admit students for fall since since Rufus delays have resulted in the Graduate College having no student information system yet in which to admit students

4. Planning and Strategy Committee (Hans Kruse)

- A. Individual Interdisciplinary Program: Hans summarized the two concerns that the committee had about anchoring students in a home department and have good processes for reviews and degree completion. He acknowledged the support of the Graduate College towards this program. He also added that one of the departments has to express academic (not necessarily financial) support and thus be the primary department. The primary department would provide a specific set of rules and regulations to be followed for degree completion. He said that they have also streamlined some forms and the proposal looks good. Nick Creary said that the primary department has to be represented on the guidance committee and the academic advisor does not have to be the guidance committee chair; it can be anyone with the appropriate degrees. He also added that the academic advisor does not have to be the guidance committee chair. Discussion also focused on how the IIP could be beneficial from the perspective of faculty. In response to a question from Molly Morris about graduate faculty status for committee members, Nick said that they would work the same way through the department as it would for other students. Jennifer Hines said that this can be addressed during the discussion and finalizing the document about graduate faculty status currently under consideration by Graduate Council.

Jennifer Horner said that the current IIP document seems to lay emphasis on employees, and that it would be important to be able to balance other groups as well. Joseph Bernt commented that the emphasis on employees is probably a relic from the past. In response to a question about library resources, Jan Maxwell said that library resources do not have restrictions for students based on their departments. Hans said that some departments have books etc, for use only by their students and that privilege would have to be extended to the IIP students as well. Jennifer Horner said that it seems that currently the appeals process stops at the Dean of the Graduate College. Hans said that the grade appeal process for students ends at the Dean of their academic college. She said that the process for IIP students should be consistent with the process followed by other students in different colleges. Jennifer Hines said that if an issue does not get resolved at the

college level, then it might come to the Graduate College, but so far none have come up. Jennifer Horner said that it would also be helpful to see an organizational chart. Charles Buchanan said that the design of the program states that there should be three areas and that this would exclude students who want to focus on two areas. Nick said that one of the limitations that he was working under was to not create a new program, but to revise the old program to address the issues raised against it. Jennifer Horner agreed with Charles Buchanan and said that the issue of two versus three areas would be compounded even more for Master's students. Discussion focused on if the student had two areas of interest, would the committee still require members from three areas? Howard Dewald said that students currently also have the option of having faculty from multiple areas. Charles Buchanan cautioned about clarifying things to ensure quality control. In response to Sergiu's question about qualifying examinations, Nick said that the policies of the primary department would be followed. Hans added that the content and design of course work is individualized, but the procedural rules of the primary department would apply to students. The guidance committee would need to be familiar with the policies. In response to Sergiu's question about how many students would be admitted to this program, Nick said that no cap has been set, but probably no more than 20 students. Rathindra said that it is important to keep the numbers in mind as well, since if a program becomes too small, it is not always viable. Members agreed that the policies for running this program will need to be written very clearly.

A motion to suspend rules to vote on the current proposal was approved.

The IIP proposal was approved by Graduate Council and Hans would then circulate the revised copy electronically. The revised proposal would address the issues of appeals, have a clear statement of goals, not require three areas of emphasis, will provide an organizational chart, and designate the primary support unit as the academic support unit.

5. Recruitment and Admissions Requirements Committee (Gary Chleboun):

- A. Conflict of Interest Case (Cynthia Strickland): Duncan said that he agrees with the committee's recommendations that some follow up should proceed the approval of the case, but the Graduate College does not have the resources to do so. Regarding the mitigation plans proposed for students, Ken asked what if the responsibilities that are being transferred to someone else made up 30 % of that person's job. Hans said that the mitigation plan comes from the department, and not from the committee. Joseph Bernt said that once a plan is approved, having that approval paper in a file does not necessarily mean that that individual is never faced with a situation where there would be a conflict of interest. Duncan said that we all trust the system to work. Joseph clarified that it is not necessarily a matter of trust, situations change and if it is a one year program it could be fine, but if it is a multiple year program, it makes sense for the issue to be revisited. Rathindra said that any safety mechanism that the Graduate Council deems fit to include in this process could be accommodated. He added that if it would make members more comfortable an updated report can be asked for every year.

Members voted in favor of approving Cynthia Strickland's conflict of interest case.

6. Reviewing Quarters to Semester Graduate Program Proposals (Greg Kremer):

Duncan said that he has been sitting on the Programs committee as an observer since last spring and that Jody Lamb and Ken Cutright are voting members of that committee. Greg Kremer said that the committee reviews proposals to ensure that Q2S guidelines are followed and whether the change is less or more than 50 %. He added that the text box in OCEAN that requires a note whether the change is minor or significant and well described, or significant and needs more information. Duncan said that Graduate Council does not deal with changes in courses, it only deals with changes in programs. Jennifer Hines said that the graduate programs on the list which states that there are significant changes includes proposals for new certificates and programs. Greg said that programs come up for a first approval and if information is desired or required, then they are sent for final approval.

Rathindra congratulated Patrick O'Connor for his recent contributions which can be viewed on the NSF website.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm. The next meeting is on March 11 from 2 to 4 pm in BUC 230.

Graduate Council Minutes

January 14th, 2011

Attendance: Sergiu Aizicovici, Joseph Bernt, Rathindra Bose, Duncan Brown, Charles Buchanan, Ken Cutright, Howard Dewald, Kamile Geist, Jennifer Hines, Jennifer Horner, Steve Howard, Aimee Howley, Tracy Kelly, David Koonce, Hans Kruse, Jody Lamb, Jan Maxwell, Molly Morris, David Nichols, Patrick O'Connor, Jessica Roney, Eric Rothenbuhler, Charles Smith, Katherine Tadlock and Jenna Wittwer.

Excused: Gary Chleboun, Myroslav Gerasymchuk, Christine Mattley, Shawn Ostermann, Yong Wang and Gary Weckman.

Guest: Nicholas Creary

Convened: The meeting was convened at 2:10 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the November 15th meeting

The minutes of the November 15th, 2010 meeting were approved.

2. Chair's Report (Duncan Brown)

A. Graduate Programs for Q2S:

Duncan said that the graduate programs that have already been approved at UCC will be on the agenda for the February meeting of the Graduate Council. He assured members that he has attended all of the relevant meetings of the UCC and that the graduate components of these programs were adequately dealt with through the expedited process. He also informed members that Greg Kremer will attend the February meeting of the Graduate Council. He said that initially he had thought that all of these materials could be made available to all members of the Graduate Council, but there is no secure way to do so. He said that some members of Graduate Council have access to the binders due to their memberships in other committees that are involved with the transition. And, if someone would like to view the materials, he said he would get them access to the materials.

B. Seven-Year Reviews:

Duncan thanked Charles Buchanan and the committee members for their work with the seven-year reviews. He said that he has spoken to Rob Brannan and Rob said that more seven-year reviews are slated to be coming up, but at a slower and steadier pace. He added that Rob assured him that Graduate Council is not responsible for the delays in getting these reviews processed. Duncan said that a member of the Graduate Council could sit on UCC as an ex-officio member and that it need not be the same person for all meetings. He added that he will discuss this with Rob and that he might attend the first

couple meetings. Ken asked if these reviews could be processed simultaneously at Graduate Council and UCC. Duncan said that Rob also asked whether the old linear process can be replaced with reviews being sent to Graduate Council before the Dean's and Chair's response are provided.

3. Remarks by Dean of the Graduate College (Rathindra Bose) and Interim Associate Dean of the Graduate College (Jennifer Hines)

A. NRC Review:

Rathindra Bose wished everyone a Happy New Year. He said that the information that was solicited from the programs after the NRC rankings were published has now been sent to NRC.

B. Graduate Applications:

Rathindra said that the number of graduate applications is up as compared to this time last year. This means that departments have a bigger pool to choose their students from. He said that the staff in the Graduate College is working very hard to process these applications in a timely manner. He added that this has been even more challenging since the staff is navigating two systems, paper and electronic. He said that he hopes that things will get better soon once the Rufus Initiative is fully implemented.

C. New Graduate programs:

Rathindra Bose said that there are multiple requests to start new programs. He said that he would like to request Graduate Council to consider his appeal to allow him to send the preliminary development plan (PDP) program proposals to OBOR while they are being reviewed internally at OU. He added that he will not violate the academic trust bestowed in him and that his record of having received all possible teaching awards at Kent State speaks to his integrity.

He added that another idea to consider is that of providing some sort of a bridge program for students who come with three year bachelor's degrees. He said that since those degrees are not considered to be US bachelor's equivalent, those applicants are not considered. But, if we are able to provide a pathway for those students into graduate programs, maybe through the graduate student-at-large category, we might be able to attract some more bright students. He said that this new category would also accommodate the students we are getting from Saudi Arabia and Iraq, who typically study English for at least a year before starting an academic program. The program could be structured so as to provide the students an opportunity to take a couple of classes in the department of their choice. This would give the departments a good way to judge the caliber and preparedness of the students as well.

David Koonce asked if the students who are seeking a certificate and are not enrolled in a degree program could be accommodated in this category. Rathindra noted that a certificate program has certain state regulations that need to be followed and that it might not be possible to include those students in this category. He clarified that if the student successfully completes the certificate program, they receive the Ohio University degree

(certificate, in this case). Whereas, students admitted as a graduate student-at-large would not leave with a certificate or a similar document. Rathindra also added that we would also need to consider the credit transfer option. Only a limited number of credits taken as a graduate student-at-large should be allowed to transfer to a graduate program. However, the transfer of credit rules for certificate programs are different. In response to Kamile's question about status of the integrated Bachelor's and Master's program, Rathindra noted that things are on hold at this point in time. He said that he needs clearance from Graduate Council to start a pilot project. He said that it will have to be a few departments only that could participate in this. And, he would like to see a broad range and not just STEM areas, which is where a lot of focus is currently.

David Nichols asked if there was an update whether UCC will review new programs before 2012. Ken Cutright sent an email to Jeff Giesey and was told that UCC will look at new program proposals after April 2011. Hans added that OBOR will not accept proposals unless approved by UCC. Rathindra said that since OBOR follows a two step process a program development proposal (PDP), the first step for OBOR, can be submitted to OBOR. Typically, it will come back with suggestions about improving the proposal. He reiterated that he would not do anything to compromise academic integrity. He also said that the proposal about the joint degree with King Abdul Aziz University is not a new program. It is an existing program.

D. Notification of editorial changes to the English Language Proficiency Policy:

Jennifer Hines brought members' attention to the handout in today's packet about the editorial changes made to the English Language Proficiency Policy to make it clear in light of the recently approved US citizen/permanent resident exemption language. David Koonce asked about an applicant for the online program who is neither a US citizen nor a permanent resident, has degree from the US, and has worked internationally, though not in the US. He added that since this applicant will not come to campus, he cannot be tested on arrival, as noted in the policy. Jennifer Hines said that this issue that has come up with the online programs needs to be discussed. She added that she would like this policy to be included in the catalog sooner rather than later. Duncan said that this language was crafted to reduce the number of exceptions being sought by departments (from the Graduate College) to the policy. And, that there will always be some special cases that will come up which will need to be handled on a case-by-case basis. He said that the issue with online applicants merits a discussion.

E. People Soft and On Base Update: Jennifer Hines said that the implementation of both, People Soft and On Base has been delayed for the Graduate College. She said that this is beyond the control of the Graduate College and the staff of the Graduate College is doing a good job of processing applications and all other functions.

F. Conversion to People Soft: Katie said that the conversion to People Soft is currently in process and that April 25th onwards all registration will be in People Soft and not in SIS. The team responsible for this conversion is preparing informational emails for their audience; these emails will be targeted to advisors, students, etc.

4. Planning and Strategy Committee (Hans Kruse)

- A. Individual Interdisciplinary Program: Nicholas Creary thanked everyone for the opportunity to discuss this proposal. He said that he looked at the last seven-year review of this program and agrees that the program needed changes. He said that with the degrees being conferred by the Graduate College it would foster a home and community for the students in the program. This was lacking in the format of the program when it was previously being offered. He said that he thinks it will be a small program, probably under 20 students, but will be able to foster cohort identity, particularly through the seminar course that is proposed. Hans said that the committee was not able to look into all the details of the program proposal but the committee noted that there needs to be appropriate oversight of the program to ensure quality control, maintain access to resources, and to watch out for the interest of the cohort. Hans then presented the Planning and Strategy subcommittee's alternative proposal for the IIP which proposed, amongst other items, that "students are not directly admitted to the IIP". He said that an IIP committee housed in the Graduate College which would set forth minimum requirements would be good. He said that the committee looked at the proposal from the point of view that this program provides the flexibility that the existing degree programs do not. He added that if a student who is admitted to an existing degree program is not able to fulfill his or her academic goals through that program, then the department could offer this option. He said that this would involve a reworking of the admissions process since requirements for degrees differ and it would help to stay discipline specific. Hans said that another issue to be considered it to ensure that for the Ph.D. program, at least two of the contributing programs should be Ph.D. granting programs. This will ensure that they have the appropriate course work to offer to the student.

Molly Morris said that if a student who started in a doctoral program with her decides to switch to an IIP degree, she has lost that spot for a graduate student. She said that this is problematic when there are a small number of funded slots for graduate students. This compromises the research productivity as well. Joe Bernt said that the programs have to be interested in offering this option, if they are not, they do not have to. Hans added that a department might not have the resources for this. Eric said that the process of admitting someone in this program (as proposed in the alternative proposal submitted by the subcommittee) seems to be rather complicated, since the student first has to meet the criteria for admission to a particular department. He added that if we want an interdisciplinary program then that is what it needs to be. Students need to be admitted to that program based on criteria that predict success in that area and not subject to criteria for another program.

Rathindra Bose said that the main issue is to not just to reinstate the program but to create enticing programs to retain some of our high quality faculty who do not have a Ph.D. The fundamental philosophy guiding this program is that it is truly interdisciplinary in nature. He said that the other issue that needs to be dealt with is the financial issue. He added that departmental and faculty resources are limited which might not be able to used to support an IIP candidate in a department. He said that it is possible to institute a couple of graduate assistantships through the Graduate College. Nicholas Creary said that he has a very talented graduate student who is completing her Masters in African

Studies and is applying to doctoral programs in Harvard and Colombia for a program in the History of Art Education in Ghana. He added that if she applied to either the History or the Dance or Education programs here at OU, she would not meet the admission criteria for any of those departments. Hers is truly an interdisciplinary area that intersects all the above. Discussion focused on whether Ed.D. degrees would also be offered and that a doctoral student should not have the primary department as one that does not offer a doctoral degree. Rathindra Bose said that interest for such programs typically comes from students who want to work with a particular faculty member. Nicholas Creary quelled members concerns by stating that the Graduate College is the degree granting college so academic standards are not being compromised here. Rathindra Bose said that even though the Graduate College will be responsible for the administrative functions associated with this program, we cannot underestimate the responsibilities of the Graduate Chairs and the standards that they would want the students held to. In response to Joe Bernt's comment that he feels that a student does not have a focused home with this program, Steve Howard said that based on interviews with students who were in the program, the seven-year review, the recommendation was made to centralize the program around a faculty committee housed in the Graduate College. Molly Morris echoed a similar sentiment and said that when students do not have an academic home, they often feel lost. Nicholas Creary responded to that concern saying that the proposed seminar course will provide that sense of identity to the cohort. Each term that a student is registered for classes, he or she will also have to register for the seminar course. Hans said that the structure of the seminar course will need to be such that it can cater to the varied interests of the cohort. It was also noted that a department would need to take co-ownership of students.

In response to Sergiu's question about the need for this program and whether the current structure discourages interdisciplinary work, Duncan said that not all departments provide that flexibility to students. Aimee said that most students in her college pay their way and for them to have to pay for another seminar course which may not necessarily provide a home for them does not seem too fair. Discussion focused on not leaving students in a position where they have to negotiate complicated processes including finding three committee members from disparate departments. Charles Smith said that he finds this a very exciting proposition and this program seems to be akin to the HTC. He added that the HTC students typically figure things out and he thinks that students who are interested in interdisciplinary work will be able to find their programs. He added that he would like to see this program come back.

Duncan recommended to members to send their suggestions about the program to the committee members.

B. Doctoral Hooding at Commencement:

Hans said that the committee notes that commencement ceremony is a celebration of the student's academic work and thus if the student would like to have a second escort who does not hold a terminal degree he or she can only if the person was an academic mentor to the student. Joe Bernt said that it is also a logistics issue, since it would be too cumbersome if all students had multiple escorts. Rathindra Bose reminded members that this request has typically come from the College of Health Sciences and Professions and

that it really is not appropriate for someone who does not have a terminal degree to hood someone earning a terminal degree. In response to members questions about how many escorts are allowed on stage, Katie said that on the commencement participation form students can list two escorts. She added that Graduate Council can discuss whether the professional doctoral degree students should be hooded or not. She and Jennifer Horner confirmed that professional doctoral degrees (the DPT and the Au.D.) are considered terminal degrees.

- C. Payroll issue for Graduate Students: Hans informed members that he followed up with the Payroll office regarding the disbursement of graduate students pay over a 12 month period instead of nine months. He said that it seems that there is no one heading the payroll office and that the person he spoke to is looking into things and will get back to him with the name of the person who he should speak to about this.

5. Curriculum Committee (Charles Buchanan):

Charles Buchanan said that the graduate components of the reviews differed from each other significantly and that the letters written by the chairs and deans address some of the problems that were identified in these reviews. Duncan said that all of the reviews are available through the Graduate Council website and that we act as advocates of graduate education. He said that we do not approve the reviews, we either accept the UCC approval or we don't. If Graduate Council accepts the UCC approval, the Chair of Graduate Council sends a letter noting so to the chair of UCC. He said, having to read so many together, made for a very compelling case of bringing to light the lack of resources that graduate education has been facing. He added that he can copy the Provost on the note he sends to the chair of UCC.

Graduate Council voted in favor of suspending rules to vote at the first reading of the seven-year reviews.

Graduate Council voted in favor of accepting the committee's recommendation for all the seven-year reviews.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:08 pm. The next meeting is on February 11th, 2011 from 2 to 4 pm in BUC 230.

Graduate Council Minutes

November 15th, 2010

Attendance: Joseph Bernt, Rathindra Bose, Duncan Brown, Charles Buchanan, Gary Chleboun, Kamile Geist, Jennifer Horner, Howard Dewald, Jennifer Hines, David Koonce, Hans Kruse, Tracy Leinbaugh (for Aimee Howley) Christine Mattley, Jan Maxwell, David Nichols, Patrick O'Connor, Shawn Ostermann, Eric Rothenbuhler, Yong Wang and Jenna Wittwer.

Excused: Sergiu Aizicovici, Ken Cutright, Myroslav Gerasymchuk, Steve Howard, Aimee Howley, Tracy Kelly, Jody Lamb, Molly Morris, Jessica Roney, Charles Smith, Katherine Tadlock and Gary Weckman.

Convened: The meeting was convened at 2:10 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the October 8th meeting

The minutes of the October 8th, 2010 meeting were approved.

2. Chair's Report (Duncan Brown)

A. UCC Meeting:

Duncan informed members that last week he attended the Programs committee (of the UCC) meeting. He said that so far the changes in the programs for all of the graduate programs that have gone through that committee have been below the threshold set for the programs to be given an expedited review. He added that he would like such program approvals also to follow an expedited review and approval process in Graduate Council. He added that he will bring them to the January meeting of the Graduate Council and at that point would like a suspension of rules to vote on them. He reminded members that the members of the Programs Committee of the UCC review these programs in detail.

B. Seven-Year Reviews:

Duncan said that the Program Review Committee of the UCC has said that they have 33 seven-year reviews pending approval. Duncan observed that not all of these reviews would have a graduate component. Duncan told members that an initial batch of eight reviews, all with a graduate component will be posted on the Graduate Council website. Jennifer Horner said that Rob Brannan, chair of the Academic Program Review Committee of the UCC would like to talk about the process followed and the turnaround time taken for the approval of the seven year reviews by Graduate Council. Duncan Brown said that ideally he would like these reviews to be processed within two meetings. Hans said that the Graduate Council has been doing so for several years now. And, that it is doable as long as there are three or four reviews that come through at a time. Charles Buchanan said that it would be helpful to the Curriculum Committee to have these documents before January. Duncan said that some of these reviews have been pending

for a few years now. A common reason for the delay in the review coming up for approval is the time taken by the external reviewers to send their reports.

Duncan added that he would like to come up with a way to prioritize the tasks at hand for the Graduate Council to ensure equitable distribution of the work load amongst committees.

C. Requirement of Official Transcripts :

Jennifer Hines informed members that currently all the transcripts being received by the Graduate College are being scanned and that if the provision is made to allow applicants to upload their transcripts to the College Net system, the departments will be able to view them that much sooner. She added that it is not in the applicant's best interests to submit fraudulent documents since all applicants will be required to submit official documents at the time of admission.

D. Updating the Graduate Catalog:

Jennifer Hines said that the Policies and Regulations Committee has been working on this and they have looked at the macro level issues but it would also help to have consistency regarding the admissions requirements information in the catalog. The consistency in the format is important not just for the Q2S conversion but for the RUFUS initiative as well. She added that she had met with Jeff Giesey and Gary Neiman this fall about this and the information from OCEAN will feed directly into the Q2S catalog automatically. She added that the Graduate College has received one time only money to help with the RUFUS initiative. Through that initiative the person who has been hired is collecting admissions related information from all departments. A survey has been sent to all department contacts and that information will be compiled and presented in one standard format. The format will be so designed to retain consistency while still leaving room for program variability to be reflected. She added that OCEAN was designed for undergraduate programs and that graduate programs do not really fit that mold and there is no format available to be followed. Tracy Leinbaugh told members that after the transition, Jeff Giesey will not be the person dealing with these changes; UCC will be responsible for it.

E. Named Fellowships:

Howard Dewald said that the Named Fellowship applications are reviewed in spring and the nomination for the Council of Graduate Schools Distinguished Dissertation Award is due in the summer.

F. Restarting the Individualized Interdisciplinary Program:

Duncan reminded members that the Graduate Council had received the proposal to restart the IIP with establishing a 'home' for the program in the Graduate College. The last review of the program was not very complimentary and noted that the doctoral students did not have a parent department or home and were thus not receiving appropriate advising. Jennifer Hines said that Nicholas Creary has been revising the proposal per the comments he has received from some people he has shared that document with. She added that OCEAN has a binder for the Graduate College and it has some program codes and the PhD program codes for IIP will be a part of that. Jennifer Horner said that Jeff

Giesey has asked her for degree codes for the IIP program offered through the College of Health Sciences and Professions. Jennifer Hines said that per the new proposal the IIP (if accepted), codes for each academic college would be phased out and the program would be administered centrally through the Graduate College. In response to Hans Kruse's question about how the committee should move on this, Jennifer Hines said that the approval process at the Graduate Council could take place while the Q2S approval for the same is taking place at UCC. She added that the proposal does not list any courses other than one seminar course offered by the Graduate College. Tracy Leinbaugh said that Jeff Giesey needs to be informed that colleges do not have designated IIP courses. He is probably not aware of that, she added, and that is why has asked for course numbers for IIP courses from the College of Health Sciences and Professions.

Rathindra said that without the reinstatement of the program none of these issues matter. So, if the program needs to be offered then the first thing that Graduate Council should do is to approve the reinstatement of the IIP. He added that for every graduate student involved in research, there has to be a committee helping with that. This and other administrative issues are addressed in the proposal. Tracy Leinbaugh said that for the program to be listed in People Soft, it has to go through OCEAN.

G. Hooding Ceremony:

H. Combined Bachelor's and Master's degrees:

I. Graduate Certificates:

Tracy Leinbaugh concurred that the current format of certificates requires them to be interdisciplinary. To qualify for interdisciplinary status, it can be just one class outside of the discipline and that class can be worth one credit. This format allowed the certificate to be distinguished from a minor. Joe Bernt asked about the templates on which graduate programs are modeled. Duncan Brown reminded members that the institution does not get any subsidy money from the state for non-degree students. Rathindra Bose said that typically the non-degree students from the Colleges of Education are an exception to this policy, since the state provides a method to capture subsidy for them. He added that if a graduate student at large category is created, it will allow the institution to receive subsidy for non-degree students in colleges other than the Colleges of Education. The rules about permission for classes will not change. And, like now the limit about the number of credit hours taken will also be in place. And, if some of those students choose to apply to a graduate program they can do so. Duncan Brown said that he is familiar with the idea of the student at large from other institutions. He said that his school could definitely use that category. In response to Tracy Leinbaugh's question whether the limit for the number of credits would still be as low as it is currently, Rathindra Bose said that the institution would be required to follow the guidelines prescribed by the Ohio Board of Regents.

3. Remarks by Dean of the Graduate College (Rathindra Bose) and Interim Associate Dean of the Graduate College (Jennifer Hines)

A. Subsidy for doctoral students:

Rathindra Bose informed members that the Board of Regents has proposed a new method of allocation of subsidy for doctoral students. The new proposal calls for the subsidy amount to be tied, in part to the quality of the program and not just be a pre-assigned amount per student. The proposal calls for an assessment of all doctoral programs. He said that the Regents asked if the NRC rankings could be used for determining the quality of the programs. He said that he was okay with using the rankings that listed the programs high, but was not comfortable with using the rankings that did not list the programs well. He said that not all programs were rated in the NRC rankings and that one matrix was used to rate all of the programs. He added that each program should be assessed based on the culture of that program and there have to be both internal and external evaluators. Tracy Leinbaugh said that the programs in the College of Education and Human Services go through a very rigorous accreditation process and external reviewers are involved in that process. Gary Chleboun said that the professional programs in the College of Health Sciences and Professions also go through accreditation processes that involve external reviewers. Joe Bernt said that the seven year reviews of all academic programs involve both internal and external reviews. Discussion focused on maybe adding one more external reviewer to that process.

B. Joint Degree with King Abdul Aziz University:

Rathindra said that a proposal for a joint degree program with King Abdul Aziz University in Saudi Arabia is in the works. He added that he would like to be able to send it to the Regents Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS) while the proposal is being approved through UCC. He explained that sometimes it can take a few months for RACGS to approve a program. By having both processes work in parallel, it will save significant amount of time. He also noted that if UCC does not approve the program, he will withdraw it from RACGS. Joe Bernt said that the internal review of a proposal strengthens it and thus when it goes for external approval (to RACGS) it is a much stronger proposal and thus has less chances of being rejected. Eric Rothenbuhler said that he is in favor of expediting processes but this also raises the possibility that RACGS could approve the proposal but it does not get approved internally. Rathindra Bose agreed and said that it would be a rather awkward situation. Rathindra said that he has asked for the proposal to be prepared in the format prescribed by RACGS and that he will not have the proposal presentation at RACGS until the proposal is approved by Graduate Council. David Koonce asked about the validity of the RACGS approval if substantial changes are made to the proposal internally.

Tracy Leinbaugh said that UCC will not be reviewing any new program proposals till 2012, since every existing program needs to be reviewed for the Q2S conversion. Jennifer Horner asked if it would be possible to get some clarification from UCC about this since it was stated earlier that the program approvals process for the Q2S conversion will be completed by April 2011. Rathindra Bose said that the university will lose opportunities and enrollment if we do not keep these other things going as well. Eric Rothenbuhler asked about the possibility of having a parallel set of committees that mirror the charge of the standing committees of the UCC to keep other program proposals moving. He said he understands that the members of the current standing committees cannot be expected to do more than they are already doing, but at the same

time, we cannot have things frozen as a result of the Q2S conversion as well. Duncan Brown said that a course and a seminar that his school was seeking approval for is on hold at the UCC and by the time they get around to it, the current set of students will have graduated and left. So, he agrees with having some other mechanism in place to keep things from coming to a standstill while the university works on the Q2S transition.

C. Change from MA to MS in Geography:

Rathindra Bose said that the department of Geography is seeking to change the name of their degree from an MA to an MS. He asked members that in the interest of saving time if it would be possible to have that proposal be reviewed by UCC and Graduate Council simultaneously.

D. Full time credit hour requirement for Graduate Students:

Rathindra said that the Graduate Council has already ruled on this, but Dan Weiner is not comfortable with that and has mentioned that at some meetings. So, if Graduate Council would like to review the decision made, they can do so.

4. Recruitment and Admissions Requirements Committee (Gary Chleboun)

A. Conflict of Interest Cases:

Graduate Council voted in favor of accepting the recommendation of the committee regarding Laura Nowicki's conflict of interest case.

Rathindra Bose told members that Shane Gilkey is the Assistant Vice President in his unit and would like to begin the MPA program. He said that he reviewed the management plan with Jo Ellen Sherow from his unit and has expanded the plan to note that all the approvals for incentive funds and other monies that Shane was responsible for would now go through him. Gary Chleboun said that the committee had approved the previous plan and if this is a more stringent plan, the committee does not see a problem with it. Graduate Council voted in favor of accepting the recommendation of the committee regarding the management plan for Shane Gilkey's conflict of interest case.

Gary asked if there was any follow up regarding these management plans that are proposed and approved by Graduate Council. Rathindra Bose said that maybe Katie Tadlock could do a periodic report about compliance of these plans. Duncan Brown said that due to the restructuring of the colleges, there were some cases that had to be reviewed again. He said that Katie Tadlock brought those to his attention. It was agreed that some sort of a follow up or a report about these cases would be desirable.

B. English Language Proficiency and Testing Policy:

Gary Chleboun said that the proposed policy is broad enough that it should encompass many exceptions that the Graduate College sees. He added that it is, however, not possible to have a policy that would cover all the possible nuances in such situations. David Koonce asked about the statement that the non-native speakers who are exempt from submitting English Proficiency scores for admission purposes are tested upon arrival. He said that the online students do not arrive on campus, so how is this enforced

for them. Jennifer Hines said that most of the online programs thus far have had some sort of a residency component, but some of the newer online programs do not have that. She added that the system is working for now, but will need to be looked at to address this issue.

Duncan brought members' attention to the new policy and said that main difference between this and the previous proposal is the change from 'and' to 'and/or' for the work requirement in the US for non-native speakers of English being exempt from submitting an English Proficiency score for graduate admission. Duncan Brown asked if voting on this item in January would cause any issues for the Graduate College. Jennifer Hines said that Rathindra Bose signs off on each of the exceptions made to the policy. Rathindra Bose added that it is better to have a rule or policy for things like this which are granted exceptions frequently. Also, the practice of requesting exceptions might turn out to be disadvantageous to some departments, if they are not aware of the process to do so. Hans Kruse said that it seems that the two issues can be addressed independent of each other and the issue about testing upon arrival can be discussed at the January meeting. Kamile Geist asked if the phrase 'current work experience' meant that someone had to be employed at the time of applying for a graduate program. Discussion focused on making the language more specific and to change the 'are exempt' to 'maybe exempt' in the new policy. Eric Rothenbuhler added that the change to 'maybe' conveys that being exempt from the policy is not an entitlement. The new language for the policy is:

'At the discretion of individual academic programs, the following non-native English speakers may be exempt from the English Proficiency Testing Policy:

Applicants who are US citizens/permanent residents and who meet one or both of the following criteria:

Within the past two years have received a bachelor's or advanced degree from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States or a foreign college or university accredited by a Regional U.S. accrediting organization (where English is the language of instruction), and/or

Who have significant and recent work experience in an English-language environment.'

Gary said that this policy gives departments room to review requirements. Rathindra added that none of the exceptions granted were initiated by the Graduate College, all requests for exceptions came from academic departments.

C. English Provisional Admit Status:

Graduate Council agreed to uphold the policy about graduate students being eligible to take graduate level academic classes only upon achieving a 500 on the English Proficiency test. Jennifer Hines noted that it can be suggested to students to sit in some classes or to take undergraduate classes to connect with their academic programs and faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm. The next meeting is on January 14th, 2011 from 2 to 4 pm in BUC 230.

Graduate Council Minutes

October 8th, 2010

Attendance: Sergiu Aizicovici, Rathindra Bose, Duncan Brown, Charles Buchanan, Ken Cutright, Howard Dewald, Myroslav Gerasymchuk, Jennifer Hines, Steve Howard, Tracy Kelly, David Koonce, Hans Kruse, Jan Maxwell, David Nichols, Patrick O'Connor, Shawn Ostermann, Jessica Roney, Eric Rothenbuhler, Katherine Tadlock, Gary Weckman, and Jenna Wittwer.

Excused: Joseph Bernt, Gary Chleboun, Kamile Geist, Jennifer Horner, Aimee Howley, Jody Lamb, Christine Mattley, Molly Morris, and Yong Wang.

Convened: The meeting was convened at 2:10 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the September 17th meeting

The minutes of the September 17th 2010 meeting were approved.

2. Chair's Report (Duncan Brown)

A. Welcome and Membership:

Duncan welcomed all new members of the Graduate Council for the 2010-2011 academic year. He said that members can serve for three years on the Graduate Council, and then can extend their membership for another three years. After that, they have to take a break for one year, before being appointed again on Graduate Council. The six year term on Graduate Council facilitates institutional memory and the three year membership allows for no more than five members to be replaced in any given year. However, sometime things change for members and some might resign before the end of their term. This could cause a larger number of new members being appointed some years.

B. Seven Year Reviews:

Duncan said that there are about seven program reviews that Graduate Council needs to review. He added that he will have them posted on the Graduate Council website and will send them to the Curriculum Committee.

C. Q2S Changes:

For the benefit of new members, Duncan reminded everyone that Graduate Council does not approve new courses, but approves new graduate programs. In the light of all programs having to propose a new model of offering their degrees, he is seeking members' advice about the approval process. He said that he has been attending the Programs Committee meetings of the UCC (chaired by Greg Kremer) since this past spring. He said that they have reviewed 10 or more graduate programs thus far. Though, there are significant changes in the undergraduate components of the programs, the

graduate components typically have had minor changes which have been below the 8% threshold. Most changes in the graduate components have been about the conversion of numbers from one system to the other. He added that it seemed pointless for members of the Graduate Council to do similar checks that the Programs Committee is doing. Hans said that Graduate Council has processes for expedited reviews for changes that are mechanical in nature. David asked if UCC would forward any reviews to Graduate Council that required a more in-depth review. Duncan replied in the affirmative and said that he will bring a list of programs for Graduate Council to go through the expedited review process.

3. Remarks by Dean of the Graduate College (Rathindra Bose) and Interim Associate Dean of the Graduate College (Jennifer Hines)

A. Environmental Scan:

He said that Jennifer Hines forwarded the environmental scan report of the Graduate College to all members of the Graduate Council. He told members that they were required to stick to a seven page limit, so if people have questions or need more information, they can check with him. He added that he is optimistic about the future of the Graduate College knowing that the College has the support of the Graduate Council. He explained that the report has three sections- description of the unit, overview of national trends, and outlook for the future. He added that he has listed some action items towards the end of the report as well. Overall, he is optimistic about the future and about bringing \$2 million more in subsidy annually.

B. NRC Survey:

Rathindra informed members that the NRC survey that published graduate rankings was released recently. He said that the previous survey was released in 1995. The report released this year is the result of data collection that began in 2005. There are 12 programs from three colleges (College of Arts and Sciences, Scripps College of Communication, Russ College of Engineering and Technology) that are featured on this list. He said that data was collected from three constituencies, students, faculty, and the Graduate Studies office. He said that after he arrived, he found that some faculty had not returned their questionnaires. Shawn cautioned members about the robustness of the data and said hence the analysis should be looked at carefully. Rathindra continued that he and Jennifer spent a couple of hours attending the webinar during the release of this report. And once the data was made public (after September 28th) many people have expressed their outrage. As a result, some supplementary questionnaires will be forthcoming.

Duncan said that the Chronicle of Higher Education had a nice article about this. Jennifer brought members' attention to page 10 of today's packet and reiterated that the database is huge and the data used for this report is old. She also showed members the website for the entire report. She added that it will be helpful to have some supplemental information to interpret the report better. For example, if the number of students admitted is zero then the number of students funded can only be zero. The automated calculation from this can

then only be that 0% of the admitted students were funded. So, this makes it rather challenging to glean correct information from the analysis. Jennifer informed members that programs were ranked on two different scales, on an 'R' and an 'S' scale.

In response to David's question about the selection of programs, Rathindra said that all the programs were sent questionnaires to respond to. Eric said that there are problems with the presentation of the data as well given that some academic fields are very heterogeneous. He said that the field of 'Communication' has four competing national associations. The National Communication Association lists 15 different areas of specialization within Communication. Eric explained that the 'S' rankings were derived from assigning weights to responses of questions about the importance given to the 21 characteristics identified for all programs. The 'R' rankings were derived from assigning weights to the responses to questions about rating the best programs in that field. Rathindra said that based on these rankings the Physics program at the University of Hawaii ranked higher than the Physics programs at Harvard, Stanford, and Berkley.

- C. Joint Degree with King Abdul Aziz University: Rathindra said that a proposal for a joint degree program with King Abdul Aziz University in Saudi Arabia is in the works. He added that he would like to be able to send it to the Regents Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS) while the proposal is being approved through UCC. He explained that sometimes it can take a few months for RACGS to approve a program. By having both processes work in parallel, it will save significant amount of time. He also noted that if UCC does not approve the program, he will withdraw it from RACGS.

Remarks by Katie Tadlock:

- D. Guidelines for submission of Proposals for Certificates:

Discussion focused on the issue that the certificates are designated as interdisciplinary by UCC, and that there are currently graduate students in certificate-like programs (e.g., Education license endorsement programs) that of necessity have to be considered as non-degree students since the program is not interdisciplinary and thus cannot be approved as a certificate. Students who enroll in these certificate-like non-degree programs, if they are not already pursuing a degree at OU, are considered non-degree seeking students. Katie said that this puts OU at a competitive disadvantage compared to other institutions. The non-degree status students are not eligible for financial aid, but at another institution where they would not be considered a non-degree student for being enrolled in a similar certificate, they would be eligible for financial aid. Duncan said that he would like the Policies and Regulations committee to look at it. Rathindra said that Graduate Council could make a recommendation to UCC to change this policy. Hans said that UCC probably designated certificates as interdisciplinary in nature because no distinction was made between undergraduate and graduate certificates. Thus, it would be appropriate to recommend to UCC to differentiate between undergraduate and graduate certificates. Shawn agreed and added that the certificate could thus be redefined. Katie said that certificates are coded as minors in the Student Information System. Duncan said that he

would contact the Registrar's office to see if someone could come and explain the administrative practices behind it.

4. Update on Contact Manager and other electronic initiatives (Katie Tadlock and Angie McCutcheon)

Katie said that through Contact Manager (part of the CollegeNet electronic admissions package) the Graduate College is able to provide transparency to departments about all the various documents being received for any applicant. All documents (transcripts, test scores, etc.) received are logged in the system with the date they were received. She added that as of a few weeks ago, all transcripts that are being received are being scanned and uploaded to the applicant's record in Contact Manager. Fairly soon, departments will receive emails that a document is available. Katie assured members that the documents are housed on a secure third party server. She said that data is fed from SIS to Contact Manager and discussions are ongoing about running a data feed from PeopleSoft to Contact Manager. In response to Shawn's question about access to this information, Katie said that the department contacts who download graduate applications, have access to Contact Manager. She also noted that members of one department sometimes share the log-in information among themselves. Each log-in is tied to a set of parameters that define the information accessible to that contact. For example, the Center for International Studies, one person has access to all the applications for all the five programs offered. In response to David's question whether this was On Base, Angie said that this is a stop gap measure until 'On Base' is made available for use. Even though two years ago, the Graduate College had been given a priority ranking for the transition to On Base, the Graduate College is still having to wait for the project to be started.

Duncan said that this would mean that the departments would not receive paper copies of the applications. Katie answered that paper copies of applications have not been sent to the departments for a couple of years because they are immediately available to departments electronically through the CollegeNet system. The department contacts may be printing those. She also added that the delivery of paper materials is not efficient. Katie said that department contacts will not have to rush into learning to use People Soft, since Contact Manager will have all the pertinent information for them. Jennifer said that another advantage of using Contact Manager is that the departments do not have to keep shadow data bases. Contact Manager has the capability to run reports and departments can use that functionality. Katie said that the potential of People Soft and On Base are significant and that there will also be more control over security with the People Soft and On Base system in place, but until then the Graduate College will continue to use Contact Manager.

5. Policies and Regulations Committee (David Koonce, Chair)

A. Graduate Catalog and Q2S Changes:

David informed members that some of the conversions from quarter to semester are straightforward, but some require more information. One of the items of discussion for the committee is about program descriptions that will need to be updated for each

program offered. Discussion about adding staff for updates to the catalog has been taking place.

B. Program-level ethics statement:

David asked members about the focus of the ethics statement, whether it needs to be student or faculty focused. He also asked about the breadth of the statement, whether it needs to be a very detailed document or just a brief list of do's and don'ts. He added that the Student Honor code sort of covers this topic and the faculty handbook has the text for faculty to follow. Jennifer clarified that the original charge for an ethics statement came from the task force for the creation of the Graduate College which had noted that an ethics statement be housed on the Graduate College website. Graduate Council can decide if this approach makes the most sense now or if there are more appropriate approaches and also can define the scope and nature of the statement(s). Rathindra said that the Student Honor Code typically applies to undergraduate students and that the research requirements of graduate students differ from those of undergraduate students. Shawn said the Honors Tutorial College students are involved in research and it would be strange to have a stricter statement for graduate students. Rathindra added that the National Science Foundation's requirements about responsible ethical and moral conduct need to be kept in mind. Eric suggested that it can be a brief statement that builds upon the Student Honor Code and it can include text to the effect that each discipline is required to abide by the code of conduct of their professional organization. Duncan asked whether we could address teaching requirements in there as well. He said that there are a lot of graduate students who teach undergraduate classes. Charles asked if the committee could look at some templates from other institution to help identify the kinds of items that such statements address.

6. Recruitment and Admissions Requirements Committee (Gary Chleboun, Chair)

A. Conflict of Interest Cases:

Duncan requested members to suspend rules and vote at the first meeting, so that the candidates whose cases are approved today can officially enroll in the classes they are already sitting in. Members voted in favor of suspending the rules to vote at the first reading of the conflict of interest cases.

Members voted in favor of Brooks Neal's case to allow him to pursue the Masters of Sports Administration.

Members voted in favor of Sheryl House's case to allow her to take the non-degree course that she would like to take for her Doctorate in Nursing Practice program which she is pursuing at OSU.

Laura Nowicki's case was sent back to the committee. Some more information is required before the case can be discussed.

Discussion of Shane Gilkey's case was postponed till the November meeting to allow Rathindra to review the management plan. Rathindra said that he is in favor of Shane pursuing the degree, but would like to review the plan that has been proposed. The office of the Vice President of Research has control over the disbursement of some monies, like the Research Incentive program grants and he would like to ensure that the proposed plan does not any way conflicts with that.

Members also noted that the text in the paragraph noting the management plan needs to be edited so as the MPA is not listed as being offered through the College of Arts and Sciences, but through the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs.

B. Suggestions for discussion about TOEFL exemptions:

This item will be discussed further at the November meeting. Duncan said that this change in policy impacts a very small group of applicants; but, from the brief discussion at the September meeting, it is clear that the issue needs to be addressed. Jennifer said that she had sent her notes to all members from the meeting with the Provost in June about the English language proficiency requirements for graduate education at Ohio University. Howard asked how broadly the two year time period is defined. One of the conditions noted in the proposed policy is that applicants "should have within the past two years have received a bachelor's or advanced degree from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States or a foreign college or university accredited by a Regional U.S. accrediting organization (where English is the language of instruction)."

Ken asked what about the applicants who may have worked in the US for multiple years, but not have received their degree within the past two years. Jennifer noted that the work requirement which was listed as one of the conditions to be met is no longer a part of this new proposal. She added that the work component was included in the original proposal because all of the cases for exceptions that came through were for students who had worked in the United States. By having just the degree requirement, the exemption policy would still miss including the students who received their degree years ago, but have been working in the US as a permanent resident/US citizen for multiple years. Ken suggested some type of "OR" statement. Duncan suggested having a list of specific statements that clarify the situation for applicant who would be exempt. The committee will discuss this further.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 pm. The next meeting is on November 12th, 2010 from 2 to 4 pm in BUC 230.

Graduate Council Minutes

September 17th, 2010

Attendance: Sergiu Aizicovici, Joseph Bernt, Rathindra Bose, Duncan Brown, Gary Chleboun, Howard Dewald, Kamile Geist, Jennifer Hines, Steve Howard, Aimee Howley, Tracy Kelly, David Koonce, Hans Kruse, Christine Mattley, Molly Morris, Patrick O'Connor, Shawn Ostermann, Jessica Roney, Eric Rothenbuhler, and Katherine Tadlock.

Excused: Charles Buchanan, Ken Cutright, Jennifer Horner, Jody Lamb, Jan Maxwell, David Nichols, Yong Wang, Gary Weckman, and Jenna Wittwer.

Convened: The meeting was convened at 2:10 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the June 4th meeting

The minutes of the June 4th 2010 meeting were approved.

2. Chair's Report (Duncan Brown)

A. Welcome:

Duncan welcomed all to the first meeting of the Graduate Council for the 2010-2011 academic year.

B. Committee Membership:

Duncan handed out a list of the names of the committees and their current membership to all and requested that it would be helpful if members stayed on the same committees during this academic year. He said that having the continuity in membership this year will be helpful since there are some carry over items from the last year.

C. Approval from Provost about SPEAK Test score:

Duncan said that over the summer he received approval from the Provost's office about using the iBT speak scores to determine teaching assistantships for international students instead of waiting for them to arrive on campus and using the on-campus SPEAK test scores to determine this. He added that since this happened late in the summer, it was not possible to implement this for this fall, but in the future departments will be able to pre-approve students for teaching assistantships based on the iBT speak scores.

3. Remarks by Dean of the Graduate College (Rathindra Bose):

A. Grants Received and Royalty Income:

Rathindra welcomed members and also thanked them for their work during the past year. He said that a large number of grants were brought in by faculty over the last year, though the total amount this past year was less by \$1M than the previous year. On the other hand, he added, royalty income for OU has increased by about 20% and that no other public institution can probably match us. He also noted that the NRC rankings will be coming out on next Monday and that OU has 12 programs from three colleges (College of Arts and Sciences, Russ College of Engineering, and Scripps College of Communication) that the rankings for are eagerly awaited. He said that he and Jennifer Hines have invited Graduate Chairs and Program Chairs to view these as they are made available that day. The information is not supposed to be public until September 28th, so he decided against sharing his log in information. He, however, hoped that some colleagues will join him to look at the information as it is made available on Monday.

B. Combined Bachelors and Masters degrees:

Rathindra said that in the current environment of declining resources he is trying to find ways to provide additional revenue generating opportunities to departments. One of the ideas he would like to pursue is the plan to offer combined Bachelors and Masters degrees. He said that that this would increase the number of graduate students enrolled, which will increase the amount of subsidy received by OU. He said that for this to happen, program capacity and the willingness of programs to pursue this option needs to be determined. He added that he would like to see the programs that offer these combined degrees receive revenue, since otherwise it will be a strain on their current resources. He requested the help of Graduate Council in looking into this option.

C. Graduate Student Records: Rathindra informed members that records for current students have now been digitized.

Remarks by Jennifer Hines: Graduate College Updates:

D. Application and Admission Statistics:

Jennifer informed members that the number of graduate applications increased by 10% over those for Fall 2009. This has resulted in a 7% increase in the number of admits and a 4% increase in enrollment as of September 16th, 2010.

E. Website Restructuring:

The Graduate College website was completely restructured. This major initiative was handled in-house since the Graduate College did not have the funds to hire external help. Jennifer told members that the new website is intuitively navigable and is clear in the information it presents. She also added that she hopes that the new website will facilitate recruitment and will provide timely information to departments and programs. She added that all the graduate student-related policies have now been moved to the Graduate Catalog which was restructured and indexed last year and all the processes/policies which apply specifically to program faculty and staff are in the Graduate College Handbook on the Graduate Director's website . The fact pages of all the departments are in the process of being revised.

F. Graduate Recruitment Brochure:

Jennifer told members that the Graduate Recruitment Brochure was completed over the summer. She added that other than a little bit of assistance for lay-out, the project was completed in-house. Jennifer said that this brochure can now function as recruitment material that can be taken to fairs either by program representatives or Graduate College staff. She said that it was not possible to write about all programs in the brochure, but it still showcases graduate research, scholarship and creative activity for all prospective graduate students.

G. Contact Manager:

Jennifer informed members that Contact Manager has been functioning well. It is an online database of applicant information. She added that it is constantly being refined and monthly trainings are offered to department contacts to ease the transition from paper to electronic files. It also helps to disseminate that information faster than it takes to get documents through campus mail. Kamile asked if the training schedule was posted on the website. Jennifer said that at this point the training schedule is communicated to program graduate chairs and graduate staff via emails.

H. Graduate Fellowships:

Jennifer said that grant and fellowship application assistance is now available for all graduate students. Rathindra added that for the first time four graduate students have received Department of Energy and National Science Foundation fellowships. He added that this is the result of having a dedicated person (Roxanne Male-Brune) in that position.

I. English Language Proficiency Policy for US Citizens and Permanent Residents:

Jennifer drew members' attention to the handouts titled, 'Question for discussion by Admissions Requirements Committee' about English language proficiency for US citizens and Permanent Residents, and the 'English Language Proficiency Requirements'. She said that the Graduate College would like to propose exempting a certain set of applicants, for whom English is not their native language, from having to provide English Language Proficiency Scores. The group that the proposal seeks to exempt should meet all of the three conditions noted in the handout. The three conditions are: either a US citizen or a permanent resident, having earned a degree from an accredited university where English is the medium of instruction, and having extensive work experience (two or more years). Jennifer said that for the Fall 2010 admission cycle, several exceptions were granted for students who fit the above mentioned three criteria. This new category would enable programs to recruit students without having their departments petition for exceptions.

Aimee said that she does not think that work component should be a part of these requirements. She added that if the degree was earned at an institution where English is the language of instruction, then other conditions should not be applied. She also added that the TOEFL has a standard error of 13 to 16 points and is thus not a precise measure of someone's English language proficiency. Aimee said that the university should have a minimum standard and the colleges and departments can add to that based on their

requirements. Sergiu agreed with Aimee that the work requirement does not seem appropriate since it could potentially exclude a group of people from that category. He added that if a child who is a naturalized citizen, came to the US say as a five year old, attended US institutions, would need to have work experience to fall under this category. Joe said that he was not sure about the work requirement as well, since he sought an exception the previous year for someone and that did not work out as well as he had thought. Rathindra said that he wants to ensure that our policies are not excluding some capable admissible students. He also noted that asking for exceptions becomes a judgment issue and there could be some program chair who is not aware that he/she can ask for an exception and would thus lose a potential student.

Duncan provided an example of a student in the Media Arts and Studies program who had earned her Bachelor's degree at a university in Texas and struggled during her program here and performed miserably. Upon looking into that situation, they found that the university in Texas that she had attended required only a 530 on the TOEFL. Both Hans and David said that it makes sense to set low university minimums and have each program add specific requirements to that. This would minimize the number of exceptions sought as well. Molly said that this new category does seem like a step in the right direction. She asked if institutions admit students without English proficiency requirements. Katie read the recommendation from the Council of Graduate Schools handbook, which noted that non-native speakers of English are required to provide proof of language proficiency. Duncan said that the IELTS handbook provides better information about the likely levels of English language proficiency needed for students to be successful in various disciplines than is provided by the TOEFL documentation.

The proposal was sent to the Recruitment and Admissions Requirements Committee for discussion.

Remarks by Katie Tadlock:

J. Graduate Student Orientation:

Katie informed members that at the annual Graduate Student Orientation this year the Graduate College handed out over 500 bags to students. Last year, 400 bags were handed out, she added. She said that the feedback from the day of the orientation was positive, a survey will be sent to all students. Duncan said that students from his school who attended this orientation said positive things about it. She encouraged all to attend the orientation and noted that Rathindra's remarks were very inspiring.

K. Change in Official Transcript Requirement:

Katie drew members' attention to the handout titled, 'Question for discussion by Admissions Requirements Committee' about changing the requirement for official transcripts. The proposal notes that the applicants could upload unofficial transcripts with their application and provide official transcripts when an admission offer is made and before registering for classes. David asked if someone would reconcile the unofficial documents with the official documents. Katie said that applicants do not have an

incentive to submit false documents. Hans said that if an admission offer is made based on an unofficial document and once the official documents are received, if there is a problem, the program has lost a lot of time and essentially has to start all over again with a new offer. Eric recommended comparing the GPAs at the bottom of the transcript to check for fraud and if there is a discrepancy, then one can review the whole document. Aimee asked if there is an electronic reader for transcripts that could compare the documents so that it does not have to be done manually. Joe asked if there were any other universities besides the three listed in the handout that were accepting unofficial transcripts at the beginning of the application process. Katie said she believes there are other schools, she heard back from these three this past summer when she posted this question on the CGS listserv. She said many school representatives responded saying that it would be a good idea. Rathindra said that this is not unusual and that this would reduce the workload of the staff of the Graduate College to serve the departments better. With the current requirement of two official copies of transcripts from every post-secondary institution attended, temporary staff members worked 45-60 hours every week from December to February just opening and processing the incoming transcripts. David said that he would not like to see the job of validating these transcripts fall to faculty. Joe asked if this would make OU less attractive or prestigious (to applicants) than other schools that require official transcripts, since most applicant apply to many schools. Jennifer said that students can present their official documents upon arrival, so it will not add an extra step for anyone in the process. Rathindra said that it is his intention to be able to get the best and brightest students for OU.

The proposal was sent to the Recruitment Admissions Requirements Committee for review.

4. Committee Chairs and membership:

Duncan told members that since there are so many carry over items from last year, he is requesting members to serve on the same committees as they did last year. He added that he placed Shawn and Eric on the same committee that Jim Rankin and David Mould served on, since they replaced those two Associate Deans respectively. The items and the committees they were assigned to are listed below:

- A. Implementation of a Policy on Graduate faculty roles and responsibilities (Planning and Strategy Committee).
- B. Creation of an Ethics Statement for each graduate program (Policies and Regulations Committee).
- C. Revisions to the policy on non-degree status – including the possibility of instituting a single “graduate student at large” degree code housed in the Graduate College (Graduate Student Affairs and Fellowships). Rathindra said that when students are registered as non-degree students, like they do currently the institution does not receive any subsidy for them. He added that at Northern Illinois University they created this category which

allowed the institution to capture more subsidy. He also noted that the limitations of the number of credits allowed, and transfer of those credits to regular degree programs will need to be worked out and put in place. He said that he will need to discuss this with Mike Williford to discuss how the non-degree students are coded currently for subsidy purposes and what advantages the institution will have in coding them differently. Aimee said that there are many licensure programs in the Patton College of Education and Human Services which students enroll in as non-degree students.

D. Updating the Graduate Catalog (Policies and Regulations Committee).

E. Restarting the Individualized Interdisciplinary Program (Curriculum Committee).

Duncan said that Steve Howard and Nicholas Creary had brought forth the proposal and had started to look into it as well last year. Duncan reminded members that the IIP program was suspended after the seven year review identified that doctoral students were not receiving appropriate advising support due to the fact that the program lacked a 'home'. The Masters component seemed to be working okay, though. Steve recommended centralizing the program in the Graduate College.

F. Work with Faculty Senate to review the conflict of interest policy for employees of Ohio University who wish to pursue advanced degrees (Recruitment and Admission Requirements Committee). Duncan said that Conflict of Interest policy needs to be re-written. He said that Graduate Council should make suggestions and recommendations to Faculty Senate regarding the language for that policy. Hans recommended that the appropriate committee should draft the text and pass it as a resolution which can then be sent to Faculty Senate. He said that Graduate Council did the same for defining the membership for the Graduate Council and that process worked well. It went through Faculty Senate without a hitch. Gary agreed saying that since Graduate Council has to deal with the issues and the specific cases, we might as well write the policy.

G. Review the policy for TOEFL scores for permanent residents of the United States whose undergraduate degree is from an educational institution whose language of instruction in English (Recruitment and Admissions Requirements Committee).

H. Respond to revisions to the provisions of health care to graduate students. Duncan informed members that a few years ago the university was losing students with families due to not having good health coverage options. He said that Jackie Legg who used to work at the Hudson Health Center attended a couple of meetings of the Graduate Council and so did the Provost to talk about this issue. Tracy said that David Nichols who is one of the Graduate Student Senate representatives on Graduate Council also serves on the newly formed Campus Care Advisory committee, and will also chair an ad hoc committee of the Graduate Student Senate which will look into this. Duncan said that Graduate Council should also be represented on that committee. Rathindra said that if any committee is discussing health benefits, we should be involved since the Graduate Council can bring information about how other institutions deliver health benefits to their graduate students.

- I.* Seven year reviews (Curriculum Committee). Duncan said that so far he has already received six reviews and he will have them posted on the Graduate Council website soon.
- J.* Q2S Program approvals (Curriculum Committee). Duncan said that Graduate Council does not approve individual courses, but approves programs. He said that the campus committee for the Q2S conversion has approved eight programs so far and out of those only three had a graduate component. Jennifer said that even though UCC has approved the moving of some graduate programs from one college to the other due to the academic restructuring of the colleges, there are some program codes that are housed in the Graduate College which will need to be addressed.
- K.* Change in the requirement of official transcripts during the graduate application process (Recruitment and Admissions Committee).
- L.* Hooding of Au.D. candidates (Planning and Strategy Committee). Rathindra brought to the attention of Graduate Council that before the graduate commencement this year he received requests to have members who do not hold terminal degrees hood candidates on the stage. He requested members' input about it so that it can be addressed appropriately.
- M.* Offer combined Bachelors and Masters degrees (Planning and Strategy Committee). Rathindra said that he seeks members guidance about this issue. He said that there are fiscal implications for this and he would like to see programs recover the costs they incur in running these programs.
- N.* Graduate Student Stipends to be disbursed over 12 months (Graduate Student Affairs and Fellowships Committee). Members discussed that if a student so desires the nine month pay period should be able to be changed to a 12 month pay period. Faculty members have the option to choose either method of disbursement of their salary. Tracy had tried to get information about it last year but was not provided with the appropriate information and help from the offices she contacted. Hans said that as long as the money that pays the stipend does not have any external restrictions like the way grant money does sometimes, students should be able to have it disbursed over 12 months if they so choose. Members agreed that this should be looked into.

5. New Business

- A.* Representation of the Voinovich Center: Faculty senate has had discussion about adding a senator to represent the Voinovich Center. This will be voted upon by all faculty at Ohio University. Members of Graduate Council noted that the faculty and graduate students on Graduate Council do not represent particular programs or departments.
- B.* Graduate Student Appointment Grievance Board: Hans said that the information about the Graduate Student Appointment Grievance Board is not a part of the Faculty handbook any more. He asked where the policy was housed now. Jennifer said that she will check to ensure that it is listed in the Graduate Catalog. (JH note: The official location of the

information about the Graduate Student Appointment Grievance Board is on the Ohio University policies page, policy 28.102. The Graduate Catalog references this policy as does the Graduate College Handbook [in multiple places]).

- C. Tuition Reimbursement for dependents who pursue on-line programs: David said that he would like some discussion about the recent memo from the Provost about dependents of OU employees not being eligible for tuition benefits for online programs. In response to Eric's question about the stated justification in the memo for this policy, David said that it is probably because of the external constituencies involved.
- D. Patrick asked if any students had been admitted under the 'English Provisional' admission category and how that was working. Jennifer said that the information about applying under that category is on the restructured website and the process that a department would need to follow is noted in the Graduate College handbook. This will also be included in the Graduate Catalog soon. She said that Vicki Seefeldt West who works in the International Recruitment unit has information about which countries are sending students who fall under this category.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm. The next meeting is on October 8th, 2010 from 2 to 4 pm in BUC 230.